

Hamiltonian Light-Front Field Theory and Quantum Chromodynamics*

Robert J. Perry
Department of Physics
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

June 25, 1997

Abstract

Light-front coordinates offer a scenario in which a constituent picture of hadron structure can emerge from QCD. From the point of view of field theory, there are severe difficulties with any Hamiltonian formulation. From the point of view of QCD it is difficult to see how a constituent picture can emerge at any energy. The field theoretic difficulties lead us to introduce cutoffs that violate Lorentz covariance and gauge invariance, and a new renormalization group formalism based on a similarity transformation is used to identify cut-off dependence. Counterterms restore symmetries broken by the cutoffs, and renormalization group coupling coherence is used to fix all counterterms required here. The counterterms contain functions of longitudinal momentum fractions that severely complicate renormalization, but they also offer possible resolutions of apparent contradictions between the constituent picture and QCD.

The similarity transformation and coupling coherence are applied to QED; and it is shown that the resultant Hamiltonian leads to standard lowest order bound state results, with the Coulomb interaction emerging naturally. The same techniques are applied to QCD and with physically motivated assumptions it is shown that a simple confinement mechanism appears. Bare ‘masses’ for quarks and gluons diverge even when the cutoff is finite, leading to the question of how hadrons with finite mass emerge. Divergences in the spin-independent two-body interaction between all partons exactly cancel these mass divergences in color singlet states. The issue of confinement in the lowest order analysis is then reduced to a determination of the residual interactions, which produce logarithmic potentials in both longitudinal and transverse directions.

*Corrected version of invited lectures presented at *Hadrons 94*, Gramado, Brasil, April, 1994.

Contents

1	Credits and Outline	1
2	Motivation, Assumptions, and Strategy	3
3	Light-Front Coordinates and Renormalization	6
4	The Schwinger Model	11
5	Scalar Field Theory in 3+1 Dimensions	17
6	Wilson's Renormalization Group	23
7	Coupling Coherence	31
8	The Similarity Transformation	35
9	The Light-Front Renormalization Group	38
10	QED and QCD Hamiltonians	43
11	Positronium: QED in 3+1 Dimensions	47
12	Asymptotic Freedom	60
13	A New Confinement Mechanism	63
14	Future Prospects	72
15	Acknowledgments	78

1 Credits and Outline

I must begin with an apology for the inadequate references to the many papers upon which this work is based, and to the alternative light-front approaches that are not discussed. Avaroth Harindranath has compiled an excellent list[1] of early references on light-front field theory[2], the infinite momentum frame[3], light-front current algebra[4], and the light-cone gauge[5].

There are many relationships between the program I discuss and DLCQ (discretized light-cone quantization)[6], but I discuss DLCQ little. Initial work on solving problems in QCD using light-front field theory was done by Brodsky and Lepage, with Brodsky and Pauli later developing DLCQ. There were certainly many developments preceding this work, but very few explicit calculations existed before the DLCQ program was launched. This program has been carried forward by many people.

In these lectures I outline a program designed to solve QCD at low energies, **if** it is possible to develop a reasonable few-body *approximation* for hadrons. We know that it is possible to develop a constituent quark *model* (CQM)[7], and that Feynman's parton model[8] is consistent with QCD at high energies; but it is not clear that we can actually derive a constituent picture as an approximation for the QCD bound state problem.

Theorists have appreciated the significance of the infinite momentum frame[3] for current algebra[4] and the parton model[8] for many years, and light-front QCD in light cone gauge has been studied as a promising ground for non-perturbative calculations[6, 9]. However, little progress has been made on Hamiltonian light-front QCD in 3+1 dimensions outside of perturbation theory. We blame this impasse on an understandable assumption that non-perturbative phenomena such as confinement and chiral symmetry breaking should arise naturally from the canonical QCD Hamiltonian. While this may be true in a formal sense if we can use a regulator that maintains gauge invariance, a constituent picture will not arise in this case; and there is little indication that non-perturbative light-front Hamiltonian QCD is tractable if we use such regulators.

There are several people who have participated in the development of new ideas that may circumvent this impasse, guided by Ken Wilson. Important insights have been provided by explicit calculations in perturbative QED[10] and QCD[11, 12]. Wei-Min Zhang and Avaroth Harindranath have provided a good introduction to canonical light-front QCD with many calculations, and I refer the reader to their work[12] for important details not found here. Daniel Mustaki has studied chiral symmetry in light-front coordinates, and surveyed significant differences between light-front and equal-time chiral symmetry that provide insight into how a constituent picture with spontaneously broken chiral symmetry can arise in light-front coordinates[13]. But the significant step towards tractable non-perturbative QCD calculations has just been taken[14].

A major new technical development required by this program is the *similarity*

transformation developed by Stan Głazek and Ken Wilson[15, 16]. This transformation leads to a new renormalization group for Hamiltonians that is not plagued by problems associated with small energy denominators which other transformations produce[17, 18]. A second technical development that plays a central role in the program I outline is coupling coherence[19]. Coupling coherence fixes all new counterterms in the QCD Hamiltonian perturbatively, and can be exploited for cutoffs in the regime of asymptotic freedom.

The major ingredients missing from the program are mechanisms for confinement and chiral symmetry breaking that can be self-consistently reproduced by a non-perturbative renormalization group[20]. A means of implementing absolute confinement has been proposed for study[14], but it has serious problems. In this paper I propose a new confinement mechanism that emerges naturally from a perturbative renormalization group.

In section 2 I outline the program and its underlying assumptions. Section 3 introduces light-front coordinates and the new form renormalization takes. As a simple example I sketch a solution to the bound state problem in the Schwinger model in section 4. I turn to 3+1 dimensions in section 5 and use perturbation theory to clarify some of the renormalization problems we face.

The entire approach requires Wilson's renormalization group as an alternative to the canonical formulation of Hamiltonians, so I outline Wilson's ideas in section 6. The renormalization group indicates how the Hamiltonian runs when cutoffs are lowered, and coupling coherence assumes that some Hamiltonians remain invariant in form, with only a few canonical variables running independently with the cutoffs. This idea and some simple examples are developed in section 7. The similarity transformation provides the engine that runs a Hamiltonian renormalization group that is at least capable of producing well-behaved perturbative expansions of the running Hamiltonian, and it is sketched in section 8. The renormalization group itself takes a new form in light-front coordinates, as sketched in section 9; with qualitatively different scaling behavior in transverse and longitudinal dimensions leading to functions of longitudinal momenta in relevant and marginal operators. Section 10 contains details required for the study of gauge theories.

In section 11 I study QED and show how the Bohr binding energy for positronium can be derived in this program. Many details required for the study of QCD appear in this section, where I also begin to discuss how QED and QCD differ. In section 12 asymptotic freedom is discussed, and the precise cancellation of light-front infrared divergences required by perturbation theory is encountered.

Section 13 contains the most important new result in this paper. It is shown that the QCD Hamiltonian produced by a perturbative renormalization group and coupling coherence contains confining interactions that may survive at low energies. Finally, a discussion of what remains for the future is given in section 14.

2 Motivation, Assumptions, and Strategy

We start with the *hypothesis* that it is possible to *derive* a constituent picture for hadrons from QCD, with hadronic states and masses emerging from an equation

$$H | \Psi \rangle = E | \Psi \rangle, \quad (1)$$

where,

$$| \Psi \rangle = \phi_{q\bar{q}} | q\bar{q} \rangle + \phi_{q\bar{q}g} | q\bar{q}g \rangle + \cdots. \quad (2)$$

E is an eigenvalue that contains the invariant mass of the state, and I use shorthand notation for the Fock space components of the state (with q being a quark, $\bar{q}$ an antiquark, and g a gluon) to avoid writing complete expressions that merely obscure the point.

If a constituent picture emerges from QCD it will be possible to obtain reasonable approximations, under conditions clarified below, using only a few Fock space components in a trial state. This approach will then immediately yield masses, and given the states and properly renormalized observables (*e.g.*, the electromagnetic current operator), we can compute any physical quantity.

A major virtue of this approach is that *it stays close to physical intuition*. The high price is that it is not even vaguely as mathematically elegant as covariant perturbation theory. We sacrifice mathematical elegance and explicit symmetry for a drastic reduction in the number of degrees of freedom that must be treated non-perturbatively. If a finite dimensional Hamiltonian can be found, a wealth of powerful numerical methods can be unleashed to diagonalize it. Moreover, we can use variational methods developed to analyze nonrelativistic many-body Hamiltonians.

If this Hamiltonian is actually derived from QCD, it must lead to asymptotic freedom and the perturbative high-energy behavior that asymptotic freedom implies. It is hard to imagine how these results arise naturally from a few degrees of freedom. They do not, but the constituent picture must arise without ignoring the many-body mechanisms required to achieve asymptotic freedom.

The treatment of a field theoretic Hamiltonian must be tailored to the problem at hand. There are two important steps for the low-energy bound state problem. First, a cutoff must be introduced, and a renormalization group used to find a cutoff Hamiltonian, H^Λ , capable of giving cutoff-independent results. We must adjust the cutoff to a value most convenient for the calculation, as is done in perturbative QCD, where one chooses a renormalization scale set by external momenta in the problem.

Second, we can always write

$$H^\Lambda = \mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda + \mathcal{V}^\Lambda, \quad (3)$$

and choose $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ however we please. The key is to choose $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ reasonably[14]. If $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ is chosen incorrectly, an expansion in powers of $\mathcal{V}^\Lambda$ will not converge, even asymp-

totically. $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ must produce reasonable zeroth order results and cannot be a free Hamiltonian if we hope to solve bound state problems.

In QCD it is difficult to find a zeroth order approximation, other than the full Hamiltonian, that leads to reasonable bound state results without violating explicit gauge invariance. Quantum mechanical logic, our inability to solve non-perturbative problems in an infinite dimensional Fock space, and our desire to derive a constituent picture dictate that explicit gauge invariance be violated; so *we allow gauge invariance to become a hidden symmetry*[14].

When considering the development of a constituent Hamiltonian approximation for low energy QCD, we immediately face enormous problems. The first class of problems emerge from the viewpoint of field theory.

First, Fock space is too big. A complete field theory must be capable of solving problems that require a Fock space which is an infinite sum of cross products of infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces. We will never build a digital computer to hold such a space, and approximations should require the explicit non-perturbative use of a small part of Fock space.

Consider two simple ways to reduce Fock space. First, we can simply truncate the space by throwing away states. In field theories this leads to divergent sensitivity to the precise form of the truncation, and removing this sensitivity can be as hard as solving the full field theory. Second, we can remove or systematically reduce couplings between states that differ drastically in ‘energy.’ The similarity transformation[15, 16] allows us to exploit this second possibility and avoids many severe problems that arise in any quantum mechanical many-body problem when states are removed directly (*e.g.*, intruder states). In either case, the absurd size of Fock space is dealt with by introducing a cutoff.

After a cutoff is introduced we must address the fact that when H_0^Λ is chosen to be a free Hamiltonian, low energy states receive important contributions from states of arbitrarily large free energy (*e.g.*, perturbation theory diverges). Without renormalization the introduction of any cutoff produces divergent errors.

As a simple indication of the importance of high energy states, consider second order perturbation theory for the energy of state $|\phi_m\rangle$. The second order shift is

$$\delta E_m = \sum_{n \neq m} \frac{|\langle \phi_{0m} | V | \phi_{0n} \rangle|^2}{E_{0m} - E_{0n}}. \quad (4)$$

For local field theories in 3+1 dimensions this sum diverges as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The matrix elements between low and high energy states do not fall off rapidly enough when the couplings are local, and the free energies do not increase rapidly enough with free relativistic dispersion relations. As suggested above, we can introduce a cutoff that stops this sum at a large value of n ; but this leads to severe problems. An alternative exploited by the similarity transformation is to cut off the matrix elements, so that states with arbitrarily large energy difference do not couple. Both of these cutoffs render the sum finite; but to obtain cutoff independent results, we must move the

dominant effects of direct couplings removed by the cutoff to the Hamiltonian itself. This is the objective of renormalization theory, and we will need a new form of renormalization appropriate to our problem.

A further problem arises when we consider the ground state of any field theory. If the ground state (*i.e.*, the vacuum) has a complicated Fock space representation, there is no chance that low-lying excitations built on the physical ground state will have simple Fock space wave functions. Every wave function will include the vacuum. This is the primary motivation for choosing coordinates in which vacuum and valence states naturally separate, light-front coordinates. This does not solve the standard QCD vacuum problem, but it enables us to reformulate the vacuum problem so that it can be attacked with renormalization theory[14].

Finally, all regulators at our disposal violate Lorentz covariance and gauge invariance. There was a time when it was thought that these symmetries must be maintained explicitly even if we wish only to obtain unique answers in perturbation theory[21]. It is well understood now that this is not the case, and I give examples below that show how we can hide these symmetries and recover them in physical results. An interesting example of how one can restore gauge invariance in Lagrangian QCD after a Pauli-Villars regulator breaks it is provided by 't Hooft's original demonstration that Yang-Mills theories are renormalizable[22].

There is an additional list of problems from the point of view of QCD. In QCD hadrons are bound states of infinitely many quarks and gluons. Confinement and spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking apparently occur because hadrons are excitations on a complicated vacuum. Mechanisms such as flux tubes developing between a quark and antiquark as they separate require arbitrarily many gluons. But in the CQM hadrons are bound states of a few quarks. The parton model offers some clues to the resolution of this difficulty, but it gets around much of this problem by considering only high energy phenomena and simply parameterizing the low energy structure of hadrons. The only way that we can resolve this apparent contradiction is to move the effects of almost all quarks and gluons out of the low energy state vectors and into the Hamiltonian and other observables. This is the standard view of how the CQM should be related to QCD.

In QCD gauge invariance implies that gluons are massless to all orders in perturbation theory, and chiral symmetry implies that the up and down quarks have masses that are much less than the typical hadronic mass scale, Λ_{QCD} . But in the CQM all constituents have masses of hadronic scale, and hadron masses are primarily due to the constituent masses. To derive a constituent picture we must find a non-perturbative mechanism that generates Λ_{QCD} as a natural constituent scale. We violate important symmetries and will see that quarks and gluons are thereby forced to have large bare masses even in perturbation theory. While these bare masses lead to zero (or small) physical masses in perturbation theory, we cannot trust perturbation theory as the cutoff approaches Λ_{QCD} ; and any bare mass left at this scale may play the same role as a constituent mass in the CQM[14].

Even if partons do not gain a constituent mass through renormalization, the confinement mechanism itself produces a hadronic mass scale. This is illustrated in the bag model[23], where massless partons confined to a spherical cavity of radius R have a kinetic energy that is $\mathcal{O}(1/R)$. This kinetic energy serves the same purpose as a constituent mass, producing the bulk of a hadron's mass.

In QCD the quark-gluon and gluon-gluon coupling approaches one as the cutoff approaches Λ_{QCD} , and since gluons are massless and up and down quarks are light, it is hard to understand how interactions at low and intermediate energies will not lead to copious production of partons. In the CQM, Zweig's rule[24] states that such interactions are dominated by quark rearrangement; and though this rule does not always hold, it is much better than one would expect from perturbative QCD intuitions. Zweig's rule does emerge from QCD in an expansion in inverse powers of the number of colors, and the answer in QCD is that non-perturbative effects lead to behavior that is radically different from what is indicated by perturbation theory. We must find a natural mechanism for this non-perturbative behavior even though we consider only a few constituents at the lowest energy scale.

Finally, there are conferences devoted to the QCD vacuum problem; whereas there is no vacuum problem in the CQM. In the CQM we are given no direct clue to where the complicated vacuum structure has gone, but the parton model provides clues to how we want to approach the vacuum problem. Using light-front coordinates we first isolate the vacuum, and we then try to isolate its effects in reasonable counterterms. In other words, *we work in the broken symmetry phase of the theory*.

The answer that we invoke for almost all problems is **renormalization**. In our approach renormalization differs significantly from manifestly covariant perturbative renormalization, such as old-fashioned Feynman perturbation theory using dimensional regularization. We introduce cutoffs that violate symmetries which normally prevent a constituent picture from arising, and we use renormalization to remove cutoff dependence from physical results. As part of the renormalization procedure we remove the degrees of freedom that can mix with the bare vacuum to form a complicated physical vacuum, and we must add 'counterterms' to restore vacuum effects to physical results. The isolation of these degrees of freedom from the constituents is possible in light-front coordinates, and our discussion of how a constituent picture can arise from QCD is tied to these coordinates.

3 Light-Front Coordinates and Renormalization

Nonrelativistic physical intuition is naturally expressed in equal-time coordinates, where initial conditions are specified at a fixed time as measured in the center-of-mass rest frame and uses a Hamiltonian to determine the time-evolution of states. In these coordinates microcausal interactions force the bare vacuum to mix with states that have zero total momentum. Individual particle velocities must be less than the velocity of light, but few-body states in which partons move with small velocity in

opposite directions mix with the bare vacuum, which means that valence-like states mix with the bare vacuum. In perturbative calculations we can readily isolate and remove disconnected effects, but if the vacuum has non-perturbative structure it is not typically possible to separate its contribution from a valence contribution in equal-time coordinates. This leads to potentially insurmountable problems when trying to derive a constituent picture.

Light-front coordinates are intrinsically Minkowskian. The light-front *time* coordinate is

$$x^+ = x^0 + x^3 , \quad (5)$$

and the light-front *longitudinal space* coordinate is

$$x^- = x^0 - x^3 . \quad (6)$$

The scalar product is

$$a \cdot b = \frac{1}{2}a^+b^- + \frac{1}{2}a^-b^+ - \mathbf{a}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{b}_\perp , \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{a}_\perp$ and $\mathbf{b}_\perp$ are the transverse components of the four-vectors. This means that the light-front energy (i.e., the momentum conjugate to light-front time) is p^- and the longitudinal momentum is p^+ .

Physical particle trajectories satisfy the kinematic relativistic constraint

$$p^+ \geq 0 , \quad (8)$$

because all velocities are equal to or less than the velocity of light. Since longitudinal momentum is conserved, the only states that can mix with the zero momentum bare vacuum are those in which every bare parton has identically zero longitudinal momentum. This makes it trivial to isolate the states which mix with the vacuum.

For a free particle of mass m , the light-front energy is

$$p^- = \frac{\mathbf{p}_\perp^2 + m^2}{p^+} . \quad (9)$$

Except when $\mathbf{p}_\perp = 0$ and $m = 0$, this energy is infinite for $p^+ = 0$. In massless theories there is a set of measure zero that has a finite energy even when $p^+ = 0$, which may be important in QCD. This leads to a very interesting situation in which all states that mix with the bare vacuum (except one set of states in massless theories) have infinite free energy. If we remove these states we have some hope that we can replace their effects using renormalization theory.

This is our primary motivation for using light-front coordinates. *Vacuum degrees of freedom can be isolated, and we may be able to replace them with ‘effective’ interactions using renormalization theory.* In this case we can have complicated vacuum effects (i.e., complicated effective interactions) and still obtain a constituent picture.

We assume that this is possible, and *we always work in the ‘broken symmetry phase’ of the theory*, in which the vacuum is trivial and ‘vacuum-induced’ interactions are responsible for symmetry breaking. This strategy is motivated by the renormalization group[20], which indicates that in some cases a small number of operators dominate the evolution of the Hamiltonian (*e.g.*, marginal and relevant operators) over many orders of magnitude. In this situation we can simply add these operators to the Hamiltonian and adjust their strengths to the critical values at which the symmetry is actually hidden rather than broken explicitly. This should be a highly nontrivial task, because non-perturbative effects dominate the small- x physics near the QCD vacuum.

Transverse and longitudinal coordinates have different scaling properties and must be assigned different dimensions, as first observed by Wilson[14]. The easiest way to appreciate this formally is to note that longitudinal scaling is a boost, and this symmetry cannot be broken; while transverse scale invariance is broken by masses and by coupling renormalization. Furthermore, longitudinal locality is violated even in the free Hamiltonian and we cannot assume longitudinal locality when constructing the Hamiltonian with the aid of the renormalization group. On the other hand, it may be possible to maintain transverse locality, at least to all orders in perturbation theory; but ‘vacuum counterterms’ in particular may violate transverse locality.

This offers a way in which Λ_{QCD} can emerge as the natural bound state scale. Λ_{QCD} can set the transverse scale at which nonlocal counterterms from the vacuum or from renormalization of infrared longitudinal divergences become important, because these counterterms are allowed to explicitly contain Λ_{QCD} . In this case, if we want to learn how Λ_{QCD} managed to appear in these counterterms, either the vacuum problem must be solved or infrared longitudinal divergences must be renormalized non-perturbatively.

In this paper I assume that transverse locality is maintained to the extent permitted by the renormalization group transformation. Transverse locality cannot be perfectly manifest, because cutoffs remove momentum scales required to resolve transverse position. This process produces direct interactions that are typically short-ranged in the transverse direction. In gauge theories infrared (small longitudinal momentum) divergences allow these interactions to become long-ranged, and confining.

I will develop a light-front renormalization group, and show how it can exploit the existence of separate natural transverse and longitudinal momentum scales. The natural transverse scale relevant to low-energy bound states is Λ_{QCD} , while the only natural longitudinal scale for a single hadron is the hadron longitudinal momentum itself. In the many-hadron problem there may not be a single scale, and it can be difficult to resolve the valence partons in a small- x hadron without resolving the wee partons in a large- x hadron.

This leaves us with three renormalization problems that are signalled by the divergence of the free energy:

- (i) $\mathbf{p}_\perp^2 \rightarrow \infty$;
- (ii) $p^+ \rightarrow 0$;
- (iii) $p^+ = 0$.

The divergences from (i) are ‘ultraviolet,’ producing counterterms that are local in the transverse direction. While the counterterm structure is richer than what is required in manifestly covariant perturbation theory, in the perturbative regime we discover that masses are relevant, the chiral symmetry breaking term in the canonical QCD Hamiltonian is a relevant quark-gluon coupling, and other gauge interactions are marginal[14].

The divergences from (ii) are ‘infrared,’ producing counterterms that are nonlocal at least in the longitudinal direction and which may also be nonlocal in the transverse direction. These infrared divergences do not appear in Feynman perturbation theory in covariant gauges. They seem to cancel perturbatively if a free energy cutoff suppresses infrared behavior before the residual singularities are either directly canceled by counterterms or allowed to cancel against one another. Coupling coherence fixes the infrared divergent part of the Hamiltonian as a power series in the gauge coupling, allowing us to next consider re-summations that preserve cancellation of all infrared divergences.

Finally, (iii) is the vacuum problem discussed above. We cannot readily study the effects of removing zero modes as part of a limiting procedure, but we consider (iii) to be intricately tied to (ii). We focus on (ii) and note that the limit of arbitrarily small longitudinal momenta will exist only if we include appropriate counterterms ‘from’ (iii). The simplest example is spontaneous symmetry breaking, where tachyons appear if we do not add symmetry breaking interactions to the symmetric Hamiltonian. This leads to the possibility that these counterterms will introduce new free parameters. If there are only a few operators that need to be considered, this may not be a severe penalty.

The simplest approach to these renormalization problems is to assume transverse locality and use power counting, which is valid in the perturbative regime, to identify all relevant and marginal (*i.e.*, renormalizable) operators. These operators are not restricted by rotational symmetry, which is broken by the cutoff. They are not restricted by gauge invariance, which is also violated by the cutoff. And they are not restricted by chiral symmetry because it is broken by hidden vacuum structure. In a Euclidean renormalization group analysis power counting typically removes all but a finite number of interactions from consideration; but in a light-front renormalization group transverse and longitudinal directions scale separately, and transverse scaling runs the cutoff. The longitudinal scale is not important for the perturbative classification of operators, and as a result each allowed operator includes a function of the dimensionless ratios of all available longitudinal momenta, including any longitudinal momentum scale introduced by the cutoff. In other words, *entire functions appear*

in the relevant and marginal operators, and we must compute these functions. The simplest way to adjust the new operators is to fix covariance and gauge invariance in the physical observables.

A more ambitious approach is to develop a non-perturbative light-front renormalization group that can be used to identify the important operators directly, even when the Hamiltonian is not approximately free. We might then use coupling coherence to fix the Hamiltonian if the Hamiltonian trajectory can be computed back to the neighborhood of the Gaussian fixed point. Coupling coherence is described at length below, but the basic idea is simple. As the cutoffs change the Hamiltonian must change in a precise manner to maintain the values of all physical observables. One interesting possibility is that the Hamiltonian will not change at all, and this is called a fixed point. The fixed point is typically central in perturbative analyses. A richer possibility is that a finite number of constants that appear in the Hamiltonian, couplings and masses, change with the cutoff while the Hamiltonians functional dependence on these constants does not change. The Hamiltonian reproduces itself exactly in form, but the relative strengths of operators change because a few couplings and masses explicitly depend on the cutoff, and this happens because transverse scale invariance is a broken symmetry.

This approach is simply too ambitious right now, so I employ a compromise analysis. I start with a perturbative renormalization group analysis, near a critical Gaussian fixed point. This may give a reasonable approximation to the Hamiltonian for small coupling, but will not reveal how chiral symmetry breaking appears. Coupling coherence then fixes the Hamiltonian as a power series in the coupling,

$$H^\Lambda = h_0 + g_\Lambda h_1 + g_\Lambda^2 h_2 + \cdots, \quad (10)$$

where the operators h_i do not depend on the cutoff unless there is a physical mass. I truncate this series at a fixed order, and study the resultant Hamiltonian non-perturbatively, even though it has been derived perturbatively. Here I use bound state perturbation theory, which requires that the Hamiltonian be divided, $H^\Lambda = \mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda + \mathcal{V}^\Lambda$. In principle we can choose any $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ we please by adding and subtracting operators, but I will choose $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ directly from H^Λ in this paper, and simply move some operators to $\mathcal{V}^\Lambda$ so that they can be treated perturbatively.

The assumption with which we started is that a constituent picture arises from QCD. At high energies the constituent picture requires extremely large numbers of constituents, partons, and $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ is the free Hamiltonian. As the cutoff is lowered, the phase space available for virtual partons decreases, and eventually approaches a mass gap that signals the complete breakdown of naive perturbation theory. I assume that the constituent picture survives this transition, and that the number of partons required to approximate hadronic structure actually decreases. This is possible if interactions that do not change particle number dominate the low-energy dynamics. I assume that this happens, so we include strong interactions that are diagonal in parton number in $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$, and all operators that change parton number are put in $\mathcal{V}^\Lambda$.

In particular, a confining interaction appears directly in H when coupling coherence is used, and it relies on infrared singularities that appear only when parton number is conserved.

As a third step in this practical approach we should test the division of the Hamiltonian by making sure that perturbative corrections are small. This will reveal flaws in the Hamiltonian itself, which is estimated perturbatively, and will hopefully reveal promising non-perturbative corrections to the renormalization group evolution of the Hamiltonian that will allow us to iteratively improve the renormalization group part of the calculation.

4 The Schwinger Model

The original Schwinger model is just QED in 1+1 dimensions with a massless charged fermion. It can be solved analytically[25, 26]. Charged particles are confined because the Coulomb interaction is linear and there is only one physical particle, a massive neutral scalar particle with no self-interactions. The Fock space content of the physical states depends crucially on the coordinate system and gauge, and it is only in light-front coordinates that a simple constituent picture emerges[27, 28]. Similar results are found for QCD in 1+1 dimensions[29, 30].

The massive Schwinger model is a conceptually simple extension in which the fermion is given a bare mass[31, 32]. It is not analytically solvable, but it has a much richer phenomenological structure than the massless model. For small masses (which is equivalent to strong coupling since the coupling has the dimension of mass and it is the ratio e/m that is important) there is still a single stable massive boson; however, it experiences self-interactions that produce bound states in addition to non-trivial scattering states. As the mass increases (*i.e.*, the coupling decreases) additional stable bosons and their bound and scattering states appear, eventually leading to a spectrum that has an extremely complicated bosonic description.

The Schwinger model was first studied in Hamiltonian light-front field theory by Bergknoff[27]. My description of the model follows his closely, and I recommend his paper to the reader. Later work using DLCQ[33, 34], the lattice[35], light-front integral equations[36], and light-front Tamm-Dancoff[37] improve these calculations in some cases; but they offer no new physical insight that is not illustrated well in Bergknoff's calculations.

Before I proceed, I must warn the reader that I will completely ignore the vacuum of the model and assume that all excitations can be understood without any need to directly study the vacuum. Many theorists disagree with this assumption, but to my knowledge no one has shown any direct effect of the vacuum on states with finite momentum. If such effects can be found, the Schwinger model might offer a testing ground for the idea that effects attributed to the vacuum in Lagrangian field theory can be treated as interactions in light-front Hamiltonian field theory with zero modes removed. I should also warn the reader that 1+1 dimensional theories have many

special features that may make them practically useless as a testing ground for ideas intended for QCD in 3+1 dimensions. For my purposes it is enough that the massive Schwinger model illustrates many basic elements of light-front field theory.

Bergknoff showed that the physical boson in the light-front massless Schwinger model in light-cone gauge is a pure electron-positron state. This is an amazing result in a strong-coupling theory of massless bare particles, and it illustrates how a constituent picture may arise in QCD. The electron-positron pair is confined by the linear Coulomb potential. The kinetic energy vanishes in the massless limit, and the potential energy is minimized by a wave function that is flat in momentum space, as one might expect since a linear potential produces a state that is as localized as possible (given kinematic constraints due to the finite velocity of light) in position space.

In order to solve this theory I must first set up a large number of details. I recommend that for a first reading these details be skimmed, because the general idea is more important than the detailed manipulations. The Lagrangian for the theory is

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\psi}(i \not{\partial} - m)\psi - e\bar{\psi}\gamma_{\mu}\psi A^{\mu} - \frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} , \quad (11)$$

where $F_{\mu\nu}$ is the electromagnetic field strength tensor. I choose light-cone gauge,

$$A^+ = 0 . \quad (12)$$

In this gauge we avoid ghosts, so that the Fock space has a positive norm. This is absolutely essential if we want to apply intuitive techniques from many-body quantum mechanics.

Many calculations are simplified by the use of a chiral representation of the Dirac gamma matrices, so in this section I will use:

$$\gamma^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \quad \gamma^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \quad (13)$$

which leads to the light-front coordinate gamma matrices,

$$\gamma^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 2i & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \quad \gamma^- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -2i \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (14)$$

In light-front coordinates the fermion field ψ contains only one dynamical degree of freedom, rather than two. To see this, first define the projection operators,

$$\Lambda_+ = \frac{1}{2}\gamma^0\gamma^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \Lambda_- = \frac{1}{2}\gamma^0\gamma^- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (15)$$

Using these operators split the fermion field into two components,

$$\psi = \psi_+ + \psi_- = \Lambda_+\psi + \Lambda_-\psi . \quad (16)$$

The two-component Dirac equation in this gauge is

$$\left(\frac{i}{2}\gamma^+\partial^- + \frac{i}{2}\gamma^-\partial^+ - m - \frac{e}{2}\gamma^+A^-\right)\psi = 0 ; \quad (17)$$

which can be split into two one-component equations,

$$i\partial^-\tilde{\psi}_+ = -im\tilde{\psi}_- + eA^-\tilde{\psi}_+ , \quad (18)$$

$$i\partial^+\tilde{\psi}_- = im\tilde{\psi}_+ . \quad (19)$$

Here $\tilde{\psi}_\pm$ refers to the non-zero component of $\psi_\pm$.

The equation for ψ_+ , involves the light-front time derivative, ∂^- ; so ψ_+ is a dynamical degree of freedom that must be quantized. On the other hand, the equation for ψ_- involves only spatial derivatives, so ψ_- is a constrained degree of freedom that should be eliminated in favor of ψ_+ . Formally,

$$\tilde{\psi}_- = \frac{m}{\partial^+}\tilde{\psi}_+ . \quad (20)$$

This equation is not well-defined until boundary conditions are specified so that ∂^+ can be inverted. I will eventually define this operator in momentum space using a cutoff, but I want to delay the introduction of a cutoff until a calculation requires it.

I have chosen the gauge so that $A^+ = 0$, and the equation for A^- is

$$-\frac{1}{4}(\partial^+)^2A^- = e\psi_+^\dagger\psi_+ . \quad (21)$$

A^- is also a constrained degree of freedom, and we can formally eliminate it,

$$A^- = -\frac{4e}{(\partial^+)^2}\psi_+^\dagger\psi_+ . \quad (22)$$

We are now left with a single dynamical degree of freedom, ψ_+ , which we can quantize at $x^+ = 0$,

$$\{\psi_+(x^-), \psi_+^\dagger(y^-)\} = \Lambda_+\delta(x^- - y^-) . \quad (23)$$

We can introduce free particle creation and annihilation operators and expand the field operator at $x^+ = 0$,

$$\tilde{\psi}_+(x^-) = \int_{k^+>0} \frac{dk^+}{4\pi} \left[b_k e^{-ik\cdot x} + d_k^\dagger e^{ik\cdot x} \right] , \quad (24)$$

with,

$$\{b_k, b_p^\dagger\} = 4\pi\delta(k^+ - p^+) . \quad (25)$$

In order to simplify notation, I will often write k to mean k^+ . If I need $k^- = m^2/k^+$, I will specify the superscript.

The next step is to formally specify the Hamiltonian. I start with the canonical Hamiltonian,

$$H = \int dx^- (H_0 + V) , \quad (26)$$

$$H_0 = \psi_+^\dagger \left(\frac{m^2}{i\partial^+} \right) \psi_+ , \quad (27)$$

$$V = -2e^2 \psi_+^\dagger \psi_+ \left(\frac{1}{\partial^+} \right)^2 \psi_+^\dagger \psi_+ . \quad (28)$$

To actually calculate:

- replace ψ_+ with its expansion in terms of b_k and d_k ,
- normal-order,
- throw away constants,
- drop all operators that require b_0 and d_0 .

The free part of the Hamiltonian becomes

$$H_0 = \int_{k>0} \frac{dk}{4\pi} \left(\frac{m^2}{k} \right) (b_k^\dagger b_k + d_k^\dagger d_k) . \quad (29)$$

When $\mathcal{V}$ is normal-ordered, we encounter new one-body operators,

$$H'_0 = \frac{e^2}{2\pi} \int_{k>0} \frac{dk}{4\pi} \left[\int_{p>0} dp \left(\frac{1}{(k-p)^2} - \frac{1}{(k+p)^2} \right) \right] (b_k^\dagger b_k + d_k^\dagger d_k) . \quad (30)$$

This operator contains a divergent momentum integral. From a mathematical point of view we have been sloppy and need to carefully add boundary conditions and define how ∂^+ is inverted. However, I want to apply physical intuition and even though no physical photon has been exchanged to produce the initial interaction, I will act as if a photon has been exchanged and everywhere an ‘instantaneous photon exchange’ occurs I will cut off the momentum. In the above integral I insist,

$$|k - p| > \epsilon . \quad (31)$$

Using this cutoff we find that

$$H'_0 = \frac{e^2}{\pi} \int \frac{dk}{4\pi} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} - \frac{1}{k} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) \right) (b_k^\dagger b_k + d_k^\dagger d_k) . \quad (32)$$

Comparing this result with the original free Hamiltonian, we see that a divergent mass-like term appears; but it does not have the same dispersion relation as the bare mass. Instead of depending on the inverse momentum of the fermion, it depends on the inverse momentum cutoff, which cannot appear in any physical result. There is also a finite shift in the bare mass, with the standard dispersion relation.

The normal-ordered interactions are

$$\begin{aligned}
V' = 2e^2 \int \frac{dk_1}{4\pi} \cdots \frac{dk_4}{4\pi} 4\pi \delta(k_1 + k_2 - k_3 - k_4) \\
\left\{ -\frac{2}{(k_1 - k_3)^2} b_1^\dagger d_2^\dagger d_4 b_3 + \frac{2}{(k_1 + k_2)^2} b_1^\dagger d_2^\dagger d_3 b_4 \right. \\
\left. - \frac{1}{(k_1 - k_3)^2} (b_1^\dagger b_2^\dagger b_3 b_4 + d_1^\dagger d_2^\dagger d_3 d_4) + \cdots \right\}. \quad (33)
\end{aligned}$$

I do not display the interactions that involve the creation or annihilation of electron/positron pairs, which are important for the study of multiple boson eigenstates.

The first term in V' is the electron-positron interaction. The longitudinal momentum cutoff I introduced above requires $|k_1 - k_3| > \epsilon$, so in position space we encounter a potential which I will naively define with a Fourier transform that ignores the fact that the momentum transfer cannot exceed the momentum of the state,

$$\begin{aligned}
v(x^-) &= 4q_1 q_2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dk}{4\pi} \frac{1}{k^2} \theta(|k| - \epsilon) \exp(-\frac{i}{2} k x^-) \\
&= \frac{q_1 q_2}{\pi} \left[\frac{2}{\epsilon} - \frac{\pi}{2} |x^-| + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) \right]. \quad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

This potential contains a linear Coulomb potential that we expect in two dimensions, but it also contains a divergent constant that is negative for unlike charges and positive for like charges.

In charge neutral states the infinite constant in V' is *exactly* canceled by the divergent ‘mass’ term in H'_0 . This Hamiltonian assigns an infinite energy to states with net charge, and a finite energy as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ to charge zero states. This does not imply that charged particles are confined, but the linear potential prevents charged particles from moving to arbitrarily large separation except as charge neutral states. The confinement mechanism I propose for QCD in 3+1 dimensions shares many features with this interaction.

I would also like to mention that even though the interaction between charges is long-ranged, there are no van der Waals forces in 1+1 dimensions. It is a simple geometrical calculation to show that all long range forces between two neutral states cancel exactly. This does not happen in higher dimensions, and if we use long-range two-body operators to implement confinement we must also find many-body operators that cancel the strong long-range van der Waals interactions.

Given the complete Hamiltonian in normal-ordered form we can study bound states. A powerful tool for the initial study of bound states is the variational wave function. In this case, we can begin with a state that contains a single electron-positron pair,

$$|\Psi(P)\rangle = \int_0^P \frac{dp}{4\pi} \phi(p) b_p^\dagger d_{P-p}^\dagger |0\rangle . \quad (35)$$

The norm of this state is

$$\langle \Psi(P') | \Psi(P) \rangle = 4\pi P \delta(P' - P) \left\{ \frac{1}{P} \int_0^P \frac{dp}{4\pi} |\phi(p)|^2 \right\} , \quad (36)$$

where the factors outside the brackets provide a covariant plane wave normalization for the center-of-mass motion of the bound state, and the bracketed term should be set to one.

The expectation value of the one-body operators in the Hamiltonian is

$$\langle \Psi | H_0 + H'_0 | \Psi \rangle = \frac{1}{P} \int \frac{dk}{4\pi} \left[\frac{m^2 - e^2/\pi}{k} + \frac{m^2 - e^2/\pi}{P - k} + \frac{2e^2}{\pi\epsilon} \right] |\phi(k)|^2 , \quad (37)$$

and the expectation value of the normal-ordered interactions is

$$\langle \Psi | V' | \Psi \rangle = -\frac{4e^2}{P} \int' \frac{dk_1}{4\pi} \frac{dk_2}{4\pi} \left[\frac{1}{(k_1 - k_2)^2} - \frac{1}{P^2} \right] \phi^*(k_1) \phi(k_2) , \quad (38)$$

where I have dropped the overall plane wave norm. The prime on the last integral indicates that the range of integration in which $|k_1 - k_2| < \epsilon$ must be removed. By expanding the integrand about $k_1 = k_2$, one can easily confirm that the $1/\epsilon$ divergences cancel.

The easiest case to study is the massless Schwinger model. With $m = 0$ the energy is minimized when

$$\phi(k) = \sqrt{4\pi} , \quad (39)$$

and the invariant-mass is

$$M^2 = \frac{e^2}{\pi} . \quad (40)$$

This type of simple analysis can be used to show that *this electron-positron state is actually the exact ground state of the theory* with momentum P , and that bound states do not interact with one another. The wave function for the relative motion of the constituents becomes more complicated when the fermion is massive, because it must vanish when either fermion momentum vanishes or the kinetic energy diverges. Extremely accurate results can be obtained in this case using polynomial basis functions[37]; however, I do not want to pursue these calculations further here.

The primary purpose of introducing the Schwinger model is to illustrate that bound state center-of-mass motion is easily separated from relative motion in light-front coordinates, and that standard quantum mechanical techniques can be used to analyze the relative motion of charged particles once the Hamiltonian is found. It is intriguing that even when the fermion is massless, the states are constituent states in light-cone gauge and in light-front coordinates. This is not true in other gauges and coordinate systems. This happens because the charges screen one another perfectly, and this is exactly how we hope to see a constituent picture emerge from QCD in 3+1 dimensions.

The success of light-front field theory in 1+1 dimensions can certainly be downplayed, but it should be emphasized that no other method on the market is as powerful for bound state problems in 1+1 dimensions.

The most significant barriers to using light-front field theory to solve low energy QCD are not encountered in 1+1 dimensions. The Schwinger model is super-renormalizable, so we completely avoid serious ultraviolet divergences. There are no transverse directions, and we are not forced to introduce a cutoff that violates rotational invariance, because there are no rotations. Confinement results from the Coulomb interaction, and chiral symmetry is not spontaneously broken.

5 Scalar Field Theory in 3+1 Dimensions

The primary objective of this section is to show that cutoffs inevitably violate covariance, and to initiate the discussion of how to find counterterms. I also list details required for scalar field theory calculations and example one-loop calculations. I will spend more time talking about problems than solutions, but anyone who actually wants to do calculations in light-front field theory should get their hands dirty with scalar field theory.

Canonical light-front scalar field theory is discussed by Chang, Root and Yan[38, 39], who derive many of the results below. The Lagrangian for scalar field theory is independent of the coordinates,

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \partial^\mu \phi \partial_\mu \phi - \frac{1}{2} \mu^2 \phi^2 - \frac{\lambda}{4!} \phi^4 . \quad (41)$$

The commutation relation for the boson field is

$$[\phi(x^+, x^-, \vec{x}_\perp), \partial^+ \phi(x^+, y^-, \vec{y}_\perp)] = i \delta^3(x - y) . \quad (42)$$

In order to derive the Hamiltonian and other Poincaré generators, one typically begins with the energy-momentum tensor[38, 39]. While it is certainly possible to derive a formal, ill-defined expression for the complete tensor, I merely list the canonical Hamiltonian,

$$H = \int dx^- d^2 x_\perp \left[\frac{1}{2} \phi(x) \left(-\partial_\perp^2 + \mu^2 \right) \phi(x) + \frac{\lambda}{4!} \phi^4(x) \right]. \quad (43)$$

This provides a formal definition of the Hamiltonian, but it is not possible to complete calculations until this operator is regulated. The boson field can be expanded in terms of a free particle basis,

$$\phi(x) = \int \frac{dq^+ d^2 q_\perp}{16\pi^3 q^+} \theta(q^+) \left[a(q) e^{-iq \cdot x} + a^\dagger(q) e^{iq \cdot x} \right], \quad (44)$$

with,

$$[a(q), a^\dagger(q')] = 16\pi^3 q^+ \delta^3(q - q'). \quad (45)$$

If we use

$$\phi(x) = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^3} \delta(k^2 - \mu^2) \phi(k) e^{-ik \cdot x}, \quad (46)$$

we find that

$$\phi(q) = a(q) \quad [q^+ > 0] \quad , \quad \phi(q) = a^\dagger(-q) \quad [q^+ < 0]. \quad (47)$$

The free part of the Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &= \int dx^- d^2 x_\perp \frac{1}{2} \phi(x) \left(-\partial_\perp^2 + \mu^2 \right) \phi(x) \\ &= \int \frac{dq^+ d^2 q_\perp}{16\pi^3 q^+} \left(\frac{q_\perp^2 + \mu^2}{q^+} \right) a^\dagger(q) a(q). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

The interaction term is more complicated and I do not expand it in terms of creation and annihilation operators. Fock space eigenstates of the free Hamiltonian are

$$|q_1, q_2, \dots\rangle = a^\dagger(q_1) a^\dagger(q_2) \cdots |0\rangle, \quad (49)$$

with the normalization being

$$\langle k | q \rangle = 16\pi^3 q^+ \delta(k^+ - q^+) \delta^2(k_\perp - q_\perp). \quad (50)$$

Completeness implies that

$$1 = |0\rangle\langle 0| + \int \frac{dq^+ d^2 q_\perp}{16\pi^3 q^+} |q\rangle\langle q| + \frac{1}{2!} \int \frac{dq^+ d^2 q_\perp}{16\pi^3 q^+} \int \frac{dk^+ d^2 k_\perp}{16\pi^3 k^+} |q, k\rangle\langle q, k| + \cdots, \quad (51)$$

so we can write the free Hamiltonian as

$$\begin{aligned}
H_0 = & \int \frac{dq^+ d^2 q_\perp}{16\pi^3 q^+} \left(\frac{q_\perp^2 + \mu^2}{q^+} \right) |q\rangle \langle q| \\
& + \frac{1}{2!} \int \frac{dq^+ d^2 q_\perp}{16\pi^3 q^+} \int \frac{dk^+ d^2 k_\perp}{16\pi^3 k^+} \left(\frac{q_\perp^2 + \mu^2}{q^+} + \frac{k_\perp^2 + \mu^2}{k^+} \right) |q, k\rangle \langle q, k| + \dots
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

In order to provide further orientation, let me consider the problem of computing the Green's functions for this theory. This problem in equal-time field theory is discussed in many textbooks, and the light-front formalism is nearly identical[9]. To find the Green's functions of a theory, at $x^+ = 0$ choose the initial state $|i(0)\rangle$, allow it to evolve in light-front time to $x^+ = \tau$, and compute its overlap with a second state in the $x^+ = 0$ basis, $|f(0)\rangle$. We split the Hamiltonian into a free part H_0 and an interaction V , and find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle f(0) | i(\tau) \rangle &= (16\pi^3) \delta^3(P_f - P_i) G(f, i; \tau) = \langle f | e^{-iH\tau/2} | i \rangle \\
&= i \int \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} e^{-i\epsilon\tau/2} (16\pi^3) \delta^3(P_f - P_i) G(f, i; \epsilon) .
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

This definition differs slightly from that given in some other places. It is then straightforward to demonstrate that

$$\begin{aligned}
(16\pi^3) \delta^3(P_f - P_i) G(f, i; \epsilon) &= \langle f | \frac{1}{\epsilon - H + i0_+} | i \rangle \\
&= \langle f | \frac{1}{\epsilon - H_0 + i0_+} + \frac{1}{\epsilon - H_0 + i0_+} V \frac{1}{\epsilon - H_0 + i0_+} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\epsilon - H_0 + i0_+} V \frac{1}{\epsilon - H_0 + i0_+} V \frac{1}{\epsilon - H_0 + i0_+} + \dots | i \rangle .
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Operator products are evaluated by inserting a complete set of eigenstates of H_0 between interactions, using Eq. (51), and using

$$H_0 | q_1, q_2, \dots \rangle = \left[\sum_i q_i^- \right] | q_1, q_2, \dots \rangle , \tag{55}$$

$$q_i^- = \frac{q_{\perp i}^2 + \mu^2}{q_i^+} , \tag{56}$$

to replace operators occurring in the denominators with c-numbers.

Divergences arise from high energy states that are created and annihilated by adjacent V 's, for example, because there are an infinite number of such states. All divergences in perturbation theory come from intermediate states (internal lines) that have large free energy, so divergences occur in diagrams containing internal lines that carry large transverse momentum ('ultraviolet' divergences) and/or small longitudinal momentum ('infrared' divergences).

Given a light-front Hamiltonian, $H = H_0 + V$, we can determine the rules for constructing time-ordered perturbation theory diagrams. The diagrammatic rules allow us to evaluate all terms that occur in the expansion for the Green's functions. For ϕ^4 canonical field theory the diagrammatic rules for time-ordered connected Green's functions are:

- Draw all allowed time-ordered diagrams with the quantum numbers of the specified initial and final states on the external legs. Assign a separate momentum k^μ to each internal and external line, setting $k^- = (k_\perp^2 + \mu^2)/k^+$ for each line. The momenta are directed in the direction time flows.
- For each intermediate state there is a factor $(\epsilon - \sum_i k_i^- + i0_+)^{-1}$, where the sum is over all particles in the intermediate state.
- Integrate $\int \frac{dk^+ d^2 k_\perp}{16\pi^3 k^+} \theta(k^+)$ for each internal momentum.
- For each vertex associate a factor of $16\pi^3 \lambda \delta(K_{in}^+ - K_{out}^+) \delta^2(K_{in}^\perp - K_{out}^\perp)$, where K_{in} is the sum of momenta entering a vertex and K_{out} is the sum leaving.
- Multiply the contribution of each time-ordered diagram by a symmetry factor $1/S$, where S is the order of the permutation group of the internal lines and vertices leaving the diagram unchanged with the external lines fixed.

To obtain the Green's function, propagators for the incoming and outgoing states must be added, and one must remove an overall factor of $16\pi^3 \delta^3(P_f - P_i)$.

Given the Hamiltonian and commutation relations we can study bound and scattering states perturbatively. As a first simple example, consider the physical boson itself. The zeroth order approximation for the state is the bare boson, and there is no first order shift in the energy because the ϕ^4 interaction has no one-body matrix elements after zero modes are removed (*i.e.*, no tadpoles). The second-order shift is

$$\delta E_m = \sum_{n \neq m} \frac{|\langle m|V|n \rangle|^2}{E_{0m} - E_{0n}}, \quad (57)$$

where E_0 is the free energy. Diagrammatically this corresponds to the 'setting sun' diagram. When the bare mass is zero the shift is

$$\delta E(P) = \frac{\lambda^2}{3!P^+} \int dk_1 dk_2 dk_3 16\pi^3 \delta^3(P - k_1 - k_2 - k_3) \left[\frac{P_\perp^2}{P^+} - \frac{k_{1\perp}^2}{k_1^+} - \frac{k_{2\perp}^2}{k_2^+} - \frac{k_{3\perp}^2}{k_3^+} \right]^{-1}, \quad (58)$$

where,

$$dk_i = \frac{dk_i^+ d^2 k_{i\perp}}{16\pi^3 k_i^+}. \quad (59)$$

This expression simplifies if we introduce the natural Jacobi variables for the relative motion of the three bosons with which the bare boson mixes. These are x_i and $\mathbf{r}_i$, which are defined by

$$k_i^+ = x_i P^+ , \quad \mathbf{k}_{i\perp} = x_i \mathbf{P}_\perp + \mathbf{r}_i . \quad (60)$$

In these variables,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta E(P) = & -\frac{\lambda^2}{3!P^+} \int \frac{dx_1 d^2 r_1}{16\pi^3 x_1} \cdots \frac{dx_3 d^2 r_3}{16\pi^3 x_3} \left[\frac{r_1^2}{x_1} + \frac{r_2^2}{x_2} + \frac{r_3^2}{x_3} \right]^{-1} \\ & 16\pi^3 \delta(1 - x_1 - x_2 - x_3) \delta^2(\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2 + \mathbf{r}_3) . \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

This integral diverges. To make further progress we need to modify the calculation so that we can work with finite expressions. Anyone with training in field theory immediately considers using dimensional regularization, which typically violates fewer symmetries than other regulators. However, we need to be careful when choosing regulators, because our ultimate goal is to solve non-perturbative problems. Dimensional regularization can only be applied when all integrals that diverge are explicitly displayed when the non-perturbative problem is set up. This does not happen, for example, if we study the physical boson by diagonalizing the Hamiltonian in a Fock space representation. It is the process of diagonalization that generates integrals, and it is not clear how dimensional regularization can be applied before diagonalization.

Another regulator we might consider is Pauli-Villars, which violates gauge invariance in non-abelian gauge theories (unless the method of higher derivatives[40] is used), but preserves symmetries in other cases. What does this look like if we are diagonalizing a Hamiltonian? In Pauli-Villars we must add particles whose masses are taken to infinity at the end of a calculation and whose couplings allow them to cancel divergences caused by the mixing of physical degrees of freedom. This means that the size of Fock space is drastically increased, which is a disaster for our non-perturbative calculations. It also means that we cannot use a positive norm space and hermitian Hamiltonian, because we cannot arrange divergences to cancel in this case.

While someone may come up with a clever idea, at this point *the only way to regulate the above divergence* in a manner that can later be applied directly in non-perturbative Hamiltonian calculations *is to use a cutoff*. Moreover, *every cutoff violates manifest Lorentz covariance and gauge invariance*.

There are a large number of cutoffs that we might consider. The first class of cutoffs are functions of individual particle momenta. For example, we could introduce a cutoff on every transverse momentum, so that $|\mathbf{p}_\perp| < \Lambda$. This cutoff leads to counterterms that are local in the transverse direction, but it violates rotational and transverse boost symmetries, so that the counterterms it produces also violate these symmetries. Furthermore, in gauge theories this cutoff leaves severe divergences

coming from small longitudinal momenta. Any cutoff that depends only on single particle momenta will violate both boost and rotational symmetries.

If possible, we would like to choose a cutoff that maintains a maximal number of kinematic symmetries; because we can then use these symmetries to limit the number of counterterms even in a non-perturbative calculation. In light-front coordinates, this means that we want to form cutoffs using Jacobi coordinates similar to those above. These coordinates do not have to be functions of the total momentum of the state, but they must be functions of the momenta of several particles, such as those directly participating in an interaction. This still leaves a wide range of cutoffs to consider, but the cutoffs I ultimately employ fall into this class.

There is an additional criterion that becomes more apparent when we use a perturbative renormalization group. Ultimately we are going to introduce a cutoff and then try to adjust the Hamiltonian so that results do not depend on the explicit value of the cutoff. This is most easily done in perturbation theory, and I complete perturbative renormalization group calculations to illustrate this. Perturbative calculations lead to reasonable results only when *the cutoff is a function of the free energy variables*.

This constraint has a simple origin. If the cutoff is not a function of the energies that appear in perturbative energy denominators, such as those above, the denominator can change sign inside the range of integration and either produce new divergences or extreme sensitivity to the region of phase space in which the denominator changes sign. This is a very old problem in quantum mechanics, where we know that even small perturbations can lead to large effects in degenerate or nearly degenerate subspaces. Since I want to use a perturbative renormalization group to approximate the cutoff-dependent Hamiltonian, I will use cutoffs that depend on the free energies of particles. There are still several cutoffs we might consider. One simple choice is a cutoff on individual particle energies. This type of cutoff violates boost invariance, and it does not avoid the problem of small energy denominators. A second choice is a cutoff on the sum of single particle energies in a given state. This is simply related to the invariant-mass cutoff used in many DLCQ calculations and in many of my previous calculations. For example, we can use

$$\sum_i \frac{\mathbf{p}_{i\perp}^2 + m_i^2}{p_i^+} < \frac{\mathbf{P}_\perp^2 + \Lambda^2}{P^+}, \quad (62)$$

where $\mathbf{P}_\perp$ is the total transverse momentum of the state and P^+ is the total longitudinal momentum.

For the second-order energy shift we are studying, this last cutoff avoids the small energy denominator problem while apparently maintaining all kinematic symmetries in light-front coordinates. However, if there are spectators or we study higher order corrections, energy denominators can become small. The reason is simple. When a cutoff on the state energies is used, it is possible for the incoming and intermediate state energies to simultaneously approach the cutoff. The only way to avoid this

problem is to *use a cutoff that employs the energy differences which actually appear in the energy denominators in perturbation theory.*

The energy denominators in perturbation theory, both standard time-ordered perturbation theory and the perturbative renormalization group, involve energy differences that result from interaction vertices. In order to avoid small energy denominators we need to cut off the change in energy that occurs at individual vertices. In terms of matrix elements, if $|E_{in} - E_{out}| > \Lambda$ we want to force $\langle out|V|in \rangle$ to vanish. For the above second-order energy shift this cutoff requires

$$\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} > \left| \frac{P_\perp^2}{P^+} - \frac{k_{1\perp}^2}{k_1^+} - \frac{k_{2\perp}^2}{k_2^+} - \frac{k_{3\perp}^2}{k_3^+} \right| . \quad (63)$$

In order to use such an energy cutoff we must choose a transverse momentum scale, Λ , and a longitudinal momentum scale. I have chosen the longitudinal momentum scale to be the total longitudinal momentum, P^+ , but the presence of a longitudinal momentum scale in the cutoff leads to interesting questions that I will not address here.

This cutoff leads in Jacobi coordinates to the integral,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta E(P) = & -\frac{\lambda^2}{3!P^+} \int \frac{dx_1 d^2 r_1}{16\pi^3 x_1} \cdots \frac{dx_3 d^2 r_3}{16\pi^3 x_3} \left[\frac{r_1^2}{x_1} + \frac{r_2^2}{x_2} + \frac{r_3^2}{x_3} \right]^{-1} \\ & 16\pi^3 \delta(1 - x_1 - x_2 - x_3) \delta^2(\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2 + \mathbf{r}_3) \theta \left(\Lambda^2 - \frac{r_1^2}{x_1} - \frac{r_2^2}{x_2} - \frac{r_3^2}{x_3} \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

A simple change of variables reveals that this result is proportional to Λ^2 with no additional Λ dependence. The only dependence on the incoming momentum is $1/P^+$, and if we had chosen a different longitudinal momentum scale in the cutoff, we would find this new scale in $\delta E(P)$ rather than P^+ . So we have

$$\delta E(P) = -\frac{c\lambda^2\Lambda^2}{P^+} , \quad (65)$$

where c is a finite constant. We assumed that the bare mass is zero to get this result, which represents a negative mass-squared shift. Since negative mass-squared is unphysical, we need to add a ‘mass’ counterterm to the Hamiltonian to cancel this ‘mass’ shift. If we want to do non-perturbative calculations we have to add a bare boson mass before computing the mass shift, and adjust the bare mass to obtain the desired physical mass non-perturbatively. These ideas become clearer in the renormalization group.

6 Wilson’s Renormalization Group

This section follows a recent article on the light-front renormalization group[18], and is intended to impart the motivation for using a renormalization group and the basic

elements of renormalization group calculations.

In classical mechanics the state of a system is completely specified by a fixed number of coordinates and momenta. The objective of classical mechanics is to compute the state as a function of time, given initial conditions. The state is not regarded as fundamental; rather a Hamiltonian that governs the time evolution of the state is regarded as fundamental. In nonrelativistic quantum mechanics, we must generalize the definition of the state, so that it is specified by a ket in a state space, and we must drastically alter the theory of measurement; but it remains possible to specify a Hamiltonian that governs the time evolution of the state. In both cases the time evolution of the state is a trajectory in a Hilbert space, and the trajectory is determined by a Hamiltonian that must be discovered by fitting data. In principle, we would like to further generalize this procedure for relativistic field theory; however, any straightforward generalization that maintains locality leads to divergences that produce mathematical ambiguities. To make mathematically meaningful statements we must introduce an *ad hoc* regulator, which I assume is a cutoff for the reasons discussed in the last section. With a cutoff in place, physical results can be derived as limits of sequences of finite quantities. The renormalization group provides methods for constructing such limits that are more powerful than old-fashioned Feynman perturbation theory.

If all interactions are weak and of nearly constant strength over the entire range of scales that affect an observable, we can use standard perturbation theory to compute the observable; however, if either of these conditions is not met, we cannot directly compute observables with realistic Hamiltonians. This problem is easily appreciated by considering a simple spin system in which 1024 spins are each allowed to take two values. The Hamiltonian for this system is a $2^{1024} \times 2^{1024}$ matrix, and this matrix cannot generally be diagonalized directly. This matrix is infinitely smaller than the matrices we must consider when solving a relativistic field theory. If the interactions remain weak over all scales of interest, but change in strength significantly, we can use the perturbative renormalization group. If the interactions become strong over a large number of scales of interest, a non-perturbative renormalization group must be developed. A final possibility is that the interactions are weak over almost all scales, becoming strong only over a few scales of interest. In this case, the perturbative renormalization group can be used to eliminate the perturbative scales; after which we can use some other method to solve the remaining Hamiltonian.

The introduction of an *ad hoc* cutoff in field theory complicates the basic algorithm for computing the time evolution of a state, because we must somehow remove any dependence on the cutoff from physical matrix elements. This complication is so severe that it has caused field theorists to essentially abandon many of the most powerful tools employed in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics (*e.g.*, the Schrödinger picture). How can we make reasonable estimates in relativistic quantum mechanics? How can we guarantee that results are independent of the cutoff? How can we find a sequence of Hamiltonians that depends on the cutoff in a manner that leads to correct

results as the cutoff approaches its limit? These are the type of questions that led Wilson to completely reformulate the original Gell-Mann–Low renormalization group formalism.

Wilson adopted the same general strategy familiar from the study of the time evolution of states, adding a layer of abstraction to the original classical mechanics problem to compute ‘Hamiltonian trajectories’. The strategy is universal in physics, but the layer of abstraction leads to a great deal of confusion. In analogy to a formalism that yields the evolution of a state as time changes, he developed a formalism that yields the evolution of a Hamiltonian as the cutoff changes. In quantum mechanics a state is represented by an infinite number of coordinates in a Hilbert space, and the Hamiltonian is a linear operator that generates the time evolution of these coordinates. In the renormalization group formalism, the existence of a space in which the Hamiltonian can be represented by an infinite number of coordinates is assumed, and the cutoff evolution of these coordinates is given by the *renormalization group transformation*. The Hamiltonian is less fundamental than the renormalization group transformation, which can be used to construct trajectories of Hamiltonians. Transformations that lower the cutoff by different amounts are members of a renormalization ‘group,’ which is typically a semi-group since such transformations cannot be inverted.

Each term in a Hamiltonian can often be written as a spatial integral whose integrand is a product of derivatives and field operators. The definition of the Hamiltonian space might be a set of rules that delimit all allowed operators. These operators should be thought of as unit vectors, and the coefficients in front of these operators as coordinates. This type of operator is not usually bounded, and this is a source of divergences in field theory. To regulate these divergences the cutoff is included directly in the definition of the space of Hamiltonians. The cutoff one chooses has drastic effects on the renormalization group. One familiar example of a cutoff is the lattice, which replaces spatial integrals by sums over discrete points. The facts that the Hamiltonian can be represented by coordinates that correspond to the strengths of specific operators, and that these operators are all regulated by a cutoff that is part of the definition of the space, is all that is important at this point.

Given a space of cutoff Hamiltonians, the next step is to construct a suitable transformation. This is slightly subtle and is usually the most difficult conceptual step in a renormalization group analysis, because we must find a transformation that manages to alter the cutoff without changing the space in which the Hamiltonian lies. These two requirements seem mutually contradictory at first.

To see how these difficulties are usually averted, let me again use the lattice as an example. A typical lattice transformation consists of two steps. In the first step one reduces the number of lattice points, typically by grouping them into blocks and thereby doubling the lattice spacing; and one computes a new effective Hamiltonian on the new lattice. At this point the lattice has changed, so the space in which the Hamiltonian lies has changed. The second step in the transformation is to rescale

distances using a change of variables, so that the lattice spacing is returned to its initial value, while one or more distance units are changed. After both steps are completed the lattice itself remains unchanged, if it has an infinite volume, but the Hamiltonian changes. This shows one way to alter a cutoff without leaving the initial space of Hamiltonians. Numerically the cutoff does not change, but the units in which the cutoff is measured change.

When a similarity transformation[15, 16] is used, it is obvious that the space of Hamiltonians does not change because the space upon which the Hamiltonian acts does not change. If we consider the Hamiltonian to be an infinite dimensional matrix, a cutoff on the interaction matrix elements restricts how far non-zero matrix elements can lie off the diagonal. A similarity transformation that lowers the cutoff brings the matrix towards the diagonal. It is not necessary to introduce a rescaling transformation, but there are definite reasons to do so in a perturbative analysis, as discussed later.

Returning to the lattice example, to obtain the continuum limit (*i.e.*, remove the cutoff) we need to let the lattice spacing approach zero; but the transformation increases the lattice spacing as measured in the original distance units. While no inverse transformation that directly decreases the lattice spacing exists, we can obtain the limit in which the lattice spacing goes to zero by considering a sequence of increasingly long trajectories. Instead of fixing the initial lattice spacing, we fix the lattice spacing at the end of the trajectory and we construct a sequence of trajectories in which the initial lattice spacing is steadily decreased. We then directly seek a limit for the last part of the trajectory as it becomes infinitely long, by studying the sequence of increasingly long trajectories. This is an algorithm employed by Wilson for non-perturbative renormalization group calculations[20].

It is possible to study the cutoff limit more directly when a reasonable perturbative approximation exists. In this case, the renormalization group transformation can be approximated by an infinite number of coupled equations for the evolution of a subset of coordinates that are asymptotically complete, and these equations can be inverted to allow direct study of the Hamiltonian trajectory as the cutoff increases or decreases[41]. If it can be shown that all but a finite number of coordinates remain smaller than some chosen magnitude, it may be possible to approximate the trajectory by simply ignoring the smallest coordinates, retaining an increasing number of coordinates only as we increase the accuracy of the approximation. In this case the task of approximating a trajectory of renormalized Hamiltonians is reduced to the task of solving a finite number of coupled nonlinear difference equations.

Given a transformation T that maps a subspace of Hamiltonians into the space of Hamiltonians, with the possibility that some Hamiltonians are mapped to Hamiltonians outside the original space, we study $T[H]$. We can apply the transformation repeatedly, and construct a trajectory of Hamiltonians, with the l -th point on the trajectory being

$$H_l = T^l[H_0] . \quad (66)$$

Any infinitely long trajectory that remains inside the space is called a trajectory of renormalized Hamiltonians. If the trajectory is infinitely long, a Hamiltonian with a finite cutoff gives the same results as a Hamiltonian with an infinite cutoff; *i.e.*, it accurately describes physics at all scales even though infinitely many scales do not explicitly appear. It is assumed that the trajectory is completely determined by the initial Hamiltonian, H_0 , and T ; however, the dependence on H_0 is usually not explicitly indicated. Moreover, we will see later that boundary conditions may be specified in a much more general fashion.

Perturbative renormalization group analyses typically begin with the identification of at least one fixed point, H^* . A *fixed point* is defined to be any Hamiltonian that satisfies the condition

$$H^* = T[H^*] . \quad (67)$$

For perturbative renormalization groups the search for such fixed points is relatively easy; however, in non-perturbative studies such a search typically involves a difficult numerical trial and error calculation[20]. If H^* contains no interactions (*i.e.*, no terms with a product of more than two field operators), it is called *Gaussian*. If H^* has a massless eigenstate, it is called *critical*. If a Gaussian fixed point has no mass term, it is a *critical Gaussian* fixed point. If it has a mass term, this mass must typically be infinite, in which case it is a *trivial Gaussian* fixed point. In lattice QCD the trajectory of renormalized Hamiltonians stays near a critical Gaussian fixed point until the lattice spacing becomes sufficiently large that a transition to strong-coupling behavior occurs. If H^* contains only weak interactions, it is called *near-Gaussian*, and we may be able to use perturbation theory both to identify H^* and to accurately approximate trajectories of Hamiltonians near H^* . Of course, once the trajectory leaves the region of H^* , it is generally necessary to switch to a non-perturbative calculation of subsequent evolution. If H^* contains a strong interaction, we must use non-perturbative techniques to find H^* , but it may still be possible to produce trajectories near the fixed point using perturbation theory. The perturbative analysis in this case includes the interactions in H^* to all orders, treating only the deviations from these interactions in perturbation theory.

Consider the immediate neighborhood of the fixed point, and assume that the trajectory remains in this neighborhood. This assumption must be justified *a posteriori*, but if it is true we should write

$$H_l = H^* + \delta H_l , \quad (68)$$

and consider the trajectory of small deviations δH_l .

As long as δH_l is ‘sufficiently small,’ we can use a perturbative expansion in powers of δH_l , which leads us to consider

$$\delta H_{l+1} = L \cdot \delta H_l + N[\delta H_l] . \quad (69)$$

Here L is the linear approximation of the full transformation in the neighborhood of the fixed point, and $N[\delta H_l]$ contains all contributions to δH_{l+1} of $\mathcal{O}(\delta H_l^2)$ and higher.

The object of the renormalization group calculation is to compute trajectories and this requires a representation for δH_l . The problem of computing trajectories is one of the most common in physics, and a convenient basis for the representation of δH_l is provided by the eigenoperators of L , since L dominates the transformation near the fixed point. These eigenoperators and their eigenvalues are found by solving

$$L \cdot O_m = \lambda_m O_m . \quad (70)$$

If H^* is Gaussian or near-Gaussian it is usually straightforward to find L , and its eigenoperators and eigenvalues. This is not typically true if H^* contains strong interactions, but in QCD we hope to use a perturbative renormalization group in the regime of asymptotic freedom, and the QCD ultraviolet fixed point is apparently a critical Gaussian fixed point.

Using the eigenoperators of L as a basis we can represent δH_l ,

$$\delta H_l = \sum_{m \in R} \mu_{m_l} O_m + \sum_{m \in M} g_{m_l} O_m + \sum_{m \in I} w_{m_l} O_m . \quad (71)$$

Here the operators O_m with $m \in R$ are *relevant* (*i.e.*, $\lambda_m > 1$), the operators O_m with $m \in M$ are *marginal* (*i.e.*, $\lambda_m = 1$), and the operators with $m \in I$ are either *irrelevant* (*i.e.*, $\lambda_m < 1$) or become irrelevant after many applications of the transformation. The motivation behind this nomenclature is made clear by considering repeated application of L , which causes the relevant operators to grow exponentially, the marginal operators to remain unchanged in strength, and the irrelevant operators to decrease in magnitude exponentially. There are technical difficulties associated with the symmetry of L and the completeness of the eigenoperators that I ignore[41].

L depends both on the transformation and the fixed point, but there are always an infinite number of irrelevant operators. On the other hand, transformations of interest for Euclidean lattice field theory typically lead to a finite number of relevant and marginal operators. One of the most serious problems for a perturbative light-front renormalization group is that *an infinite number of relevant and marginal operators are required*. In the case of scalar field theory, an infinite number of relevant and marginal operators arise because the light-front cutoffs violate Lorentz covariance and cluster decomposition. These are continuous symmetries, and their violation leads to an infinite number of constraints on the Hamiltonian. The key to showing that the light-front renormalization group may not be rendered useless by an infinite number of relevant and marginal operators is the observation that both the strength and the evolution of all but a finite number of relevant and marginal operators are fixed by Lorentz covariance and cluster decomposition. This has not been proven to

all orders, and this is not the last time I will state something that has not been proven to all orders.

One alternative to employing symmetries such as covariance to fix the strength of marginal and relevant counterterms is to insist that non-canonical relevant and marginal variables are not independent functions of the cutoff, but depend on the cutoff implicitly through their dependence on canonical variables. This requirement fixes the manner in which the new variables evolve with the cutoff, and it also fixes their value at all cutoffs once the values of the canonical variables are chosen, if we insist that the new counterterms vanish when canonical interactions are turned off. The remarkable feature of this procedure is that the value it gives to the new variables is precisely the value required to restore Lorentz covariance and cluster decomposition[18] in all cases studied to date. This is *coupling coherence*.

To simplify subsequent discussion, the statement that δH_l is small is assumed to mean that all masses and couplings in the expansion of δH_l are small. The analysis itself should signal when this assumption is naive. A rigorous discussion would require consideration of the spectra of the eigenoperators. If the coefficient of a single operator (*e.g.*, a single mass) becomes large, it may be straightforward to alter the analysis so that this coefficient is included to all orders in an approximation of the transformation, so that one perturbs only in the small coefficients.

For the purpose of illustration, let me assume that $\lambda_m = 4$ for all relevant operators, and $\lambda_m = 1/4$ for all irrelevant operators. The transformation can be represented by an infinite number of coupled, nonlinear difference equations:

$$\mu_{m_{l+1}} = 4\mu_{m_l} + N_{\mu_m}[\mu_{m_l}, g_{m_l}, w_{m_l}] , \quad (72)$$

$$g_{m_{l+1}} = g_{m_l} + N_{g_m}[\mu_{m_l}, g_{m_l}, w_{m_l}] , \quad (73)$$

$$w_{m_{l+1}} = \frac{1}{4}w_{m_l} + N_{w_m}[\mu_{m_l}, g_{m_l}, w_{m_l}] . \quad (74)$$

Sufficiently near a critical Gaussian fixed point, the functions N_{μ_m} , N_{g_m} , and N_{w_m} should be adequately approximated by an expansion in powers of μ_{m_l} , g_{m_l} , and w_{m_l} . The assumption that the Hamiltonian remains in the neighborhood of the fixed point, so that all μ_{m_l} , g_{m_l} , and w_{m_l} remain small, must be justified *a posteriori*. Any precise definition of the neighborhood of the fixed point within which all approximations are valid must also be provided *a posteriori*.

Wilson has given a general discussion of how these equations are solved[20], and I repeat only the most important points. In perturbation theory these equations are equivalent to an infinite number of coupled, first-order, nonlinear differential equations. To solve them we must specify ‘boundary’ values for every variable, possibly at different l , and then employ a *stable* numerical algorithm to find the variables at all other values of l for which the trajectory remains near the fixed point. We want to apply the transformation $\mathcal{N}$ times, letting $\mathcal{N} \rightarrow \infty$, and adjusting the initial

Hamiltonian so that this limit exists. Eq. (72) must be solved by ‘integrating’ in the exponentially stable direction of decreasing l (*i.e.*, typically toward larger cutoffs), while Eq. (74) must be solved in the direction of increasing l . Eq. (73) is linearly unstable in either direction. The coupled equations must be solved using an iterative algorithm. Such systems of coupled difference equations and the algorithms required for their solution are familiar in numerical analysis. In this context the need for renormalization can be understood by considering the fact that the renormalization group difference equations need to be solved over an infinite number of scales in principle.

The final output of the renormalization group analysis is the cutoff Hamiltonian $H_{\mathcal{N}}$. If this Hamiltonian is the final point in an infinitely long trajectory of Hamiltonians, it will yield the same observables below the final cutoff as H_0 ; but for an infinitely long trajectory H_0 contains no cutoff, so $H_{\mathcal{N}}$ *will yield results that do not depend on the cutoff*. It is for this reason that $H_{\mathcal{N}}$ and all other Hamiltonians on any infinitely long trajectory are referred to as *renormalized Hamiltonians*. How we solve the final cutoff Hamiltonian problem using $H_{\mathcal{N}}$ depends on the theory. For QCD, even if $H_{\mathcal{N}}$ can be derived by purely perturbative techniques, it will have to be solved non-perturbatively because of confinement. We must have an accurate approximation for $H_{\mathcal{N}}$; however, we do not necessarily need to explicitly construct accurate approximations for all H_l .

The boundary values for the irrelevant variables should be set at $l = 0$, because we need to solve Eq. (74) in the direction of increasing l . At large l all variables are exponentially insensitive to the irrelevant boundary values. Therefore, they can be chosen arbitrarily (universality); and the values of the irrelevant variables at $l = \mathcal{N}$ are output by Wilson’s renormalization group. This is one of the differences between Wilson’s renormalization group and the Gell-Mann–Low renormalization group in which irrelevant variables are not treated. Irrelevant operators are important in $H_{\mathcal{N}}$ unless the final cutoff is much larger than the scale of physical interest. The fact that they are irrelevant implies that their final values are exponentially insensitive to their initial values; and it implies that they are driven at an exponential rate toward a function of the relevant and marginal variables, as discussed below. The fact that they are irrelevant does not necessarily imply that they are unimportant. This depends on how sensitive the physical observables of interest are to physics near the scale of the cutoff.

The boundary values required by Eqs. (72) and (73) can be given at $l = \mathcal{N}$. Sufficiently far from $l = 0$ the irrelevant variables are exponentially driven to maintain polynomial dependence on relevant and marginal variables, and sufficiently far from $l = \mathcal{N}$ the relevant variables are exponentially driven toward similar polynomial dependence on the marginal variables. While the calculation of transient behavior near $l = 0$ and $l = \mathcal{N}$ usually requires a numerical computation, the relevant and irrelevant variables are readily approximated by polynomials that involve only marginal variables in the intermediate region. These polynomials are determined by the expansions of N_{μ_m} , N_{g_m} , and N_{w_m} ; and they can be fed back into Eq. (73) to find an

approximate equation for the marginal variables that requires direct knowledge only of the marginal variables themselves.

Wilson has given an excellent discussion of the relationship between divergences in standard perturbation theory (*e.g.*, Feynman perturbation theory) and the perturbative renormalization group[20], and I close this section by repeating the most salient points. There are usually no divergences encountered when a renormalization group transformation is applied once; however, divergences can arise in the form of powers of l and exponents containing l , when T is applied a large number of times; and these divergences are directly related to the divergences in Feynman perturbation theory. There are no divergences apparent when the perturbative renormalization group equations are solved using a stable numerical algorithm; however, if we attempt to expand a coupling g_l in powers of g_0 , for example, powers of l appear. As $l \rightarrow \infty$ these powers of l lead to the divergences familiar in Feynman perturbation theory.

The perturbative renormalization group offers a significant improvement over standard perturbation theory. In standard perturbation theory we deal only with bare and renormalized parameters. Except in super-renormalizable theories, the ratio of bare and renormalized parameters goes to infinity (or zero). If a perturbative expansion of an observable in powers of the renormalized parameters converges, the expansion for the same observable in terms of the bare parameters cannot converge. This leads to some interesting departures from logic in standard perturbation theory[42]. A small contribution of the renormalization group is that logic may sometimes be restored to perturbation theory.

7 Coupling Coherence

This section develops the ideas behind coupling coherence, closely following the original paper[19] from which simple examples are taken. The basic idea behind coupling coherence was first formulated by Oehme, Sibold, and Zimmerman[43]. They were interested in field theories where many couplings appear, such as the standard model, and wanted to find some means of reducing the number of couplings. Wilson and I developed the ideas independently in an attempt to deal with the functions that appear in marginal and relevant light-front operators.

As argued above, the use of a Hamiltonian formulation, as opposed to a Lagrangian formulation, severely limits one's choice of regulators. The only practical regulators for non-perturbative Fock space calculations employ cutoffs that violate explicit Lorentz covariance and gauge invariance, opening a Pandora's box containing an infinite number of relevant and marginal operators. Counterterms must be added to the Hamiltonian to restore these symmetries to observables, and to obtain finite results. In perturbation theory, dimensional power-counting separates these operators into 'renormalizable' (*i.e.*, relevant and marginal) and 'non-renormalizable' (*i.e.*, irrelevant). Light-front divergences associated with transverse and longitudinal momenta appear separately, and a straightforward power-counting analysis requires

us to scale these momenta separately. Divergences associated with large transverse momenta lead to counterterms that contain functions of longitudinal momenta; and divergences associated with small longitudinal momenta may lead to counterterms that contain functions of transverse momenta. The appearance of entire functions of momenta in the counterterms, and the appearance of unfamiliar ‘infrared’ longitudinal divergences, significantly impacts perturbative renormalization theory.

The puzzle is how to reconcile our knowledge from covariant formulations of QCD that only one running coupling constant characterizes the renormalized theory with the infinite set of counterterms required by the light-front formulation. What happens in perturbation theory when there are an infinite number of relevant and marginal operators? In particular, does the solution of the perturbative renormalization group equations require an infinite number of independent counterterms (*i.e.*, independent functions of the cutoff)? Coupling coherence provides the conditions under which a finite number of running variables determines the renormalization group trajectory of the renormalized Hamiltonian. To leading nontrivial orders these conditions are satisfied by the counterterms introduced to restore Lorentz covariance in scalar field theory and gauge invariance in light-front gauge theories. In fact, the conditions can be used to determine all counterterms in the Hamiltonian, including relevant and marginal operators that contain functions of longitudinal momentum fractions; and with no direct reference to Lorentz covariance, this symmetry is restored to observables by the resultant counterterms in scalar field theory[18].

In this section I use simple examples in which there are a finite number of relevant and marginal operators *ab initio*, and use coupling coherence to discover when only one or two of these may independently run with the cutoff. In general such conditions are met only when an underlying symmetry exists.

Consider a theory in which two scalar fields interact,

$$V(\phi) = \frac{\lambda_1}{4!}\phi_1^4 + \frac{\lambda_2}{4!}\phi_2^4 + \frac{\lambda_3}{4!}\phi_1^2\phi_2^2. \quad (75)$$

Under what conditions will there be fewer than three running coupling constants? We can use a simple cutoff on Euclidean momenta, $q^2 < \Lambda^2$. Letting $t = \ln(\Lambda/\Lambda_0)$, the Gell-Mann–Low equations are

$$\frac{\partial\lambda_1}{\partial t} = 3\zeta\lambda_1^2 + \frac{1}{12}\zeta\lambda_3^2 + \mathcal{O}(2 \text{ loop}), \quad (76)$$

$$\frac{\partial\lambda_2}{\partial t} = 3\zeta\lambda_2^2 + \frac{1}{12}\zeta\lambda_3^2 + \mathcal{O}(2 \text{ loop}), \quad (77)$$

$$\frac{\partial\lambda_3}{\partial t} = \frac{2}{3}\zeta\lambda_3^2 + \zeta\lambda_1\lambda_3 + \zeta\lambda_2\lambda_3 + \mathcal{O}(2 \text{ loop}); \quad (78)$$

where $\zeta = \hbar/(16\pi^2)$. It is not important at this point to understand how these equations are derived.

First suppose that λ_1 and λ_2 run separately, and ask whether it is possible to find $\lambda_3(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ that solves Eq. (78). To one-loop order this leads to

$$\left(3\lambda_1^2 + \frac{1}{12}\lambda_3^2\right) \frac{\partial\lambda_3}{\partial\lambda_1} + \left(3\lambda_2^2 + \frac{1}{12}\lambda_3^2\right) \frac{\partial\lambda_3}{\partial\lambda_2} = \frac{2}{3}\lambda_3^2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3. \quad (79)$$

If λ_1 and λ_2 are independent, we can equate powers of these variables on each side of Eq. (79). If we allow the expansion of λ_3 to begin with a constant, we find a solution to Eq. (79) in which all powers of λ_1 and λ_2 appear. In this case a constant appears on the right-hand-sides of Eqs. (76) and (77), and there will be no Gaussian fixed points for λ_1 and λ_2 . We are generally not interested in the possibility that a counterterm does not vanish when the canonical coupling vanishes, so we will simply discard this solution both here and below. We are interested in the conditions under which one variable ceases to be independent, and the appearance of such an arbitrary constant indicates that the variable remains independent even though its dependence on the cutoff is being reparameterized in terms of other variables.

If we do not allow a constant in the solution, we find that $\lambda_3 = \alpha\lambda_1 + \beta\lambda_2 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2)$. When we insert this in Eq. (79) and equate powers on each side, we obtain three coupled equations for α and β . These equations have no solution other than $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta = 0$, so we conclude that if λ_1 and λ_2 are independent functions of t , λ_3 will also be an independent function of t unless the two fields decouple.

Assume that there is only one independent variable, $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda_1$, so that λ_2 and λ_3 are functions of $\tilde{\lambda}$. In this case we obtain two coupled equations,

$$\left(3\tilde{\lambda}^2 + \frac{1}{12}\lambda_3^2\right) \frac{\partial\lambda_2}{\partial\tilde{\lambda}} = 3\lambda_2^2 + \frac{1}{12}\lambda_3^2, \quad (80)$$

$$\left(3\tilde{\lambda}^2 + \frac{1}{12}\lambda_3^2\right) \frac{\partial\lambda_3}{\partial\tilde{\lambda}} = \frac{2}{3}\lambda_3^2 + \tilde{\lambda}\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3. \quad (81)$$

If we again exclude a constant term in the expansions of λ_2 and λ_3 we find that the only non-trivial solutions to leading order are $\lambda_2 = \tilde{\lambda}$, and either $\lambda_3 = 2\tilde{\lambda}$ or $\lambda_3 = 6\tilde{\lambda}$. If $\lambda_3 = 2\tilde{\lambda}$,

$$V(\phi) = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}}{4!} (\phi_1^2 + \phi_2^2)^2, \quad (82)$$

and we find the $O(2)$ symmetric theory. If $\lambda_3 = 6\tilde{\lambda}$,

$$V(\phi) = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}}{2 \cdot 4!} [(\phi_1 + \phi_2)^4 + (\phi_1 - \phi_2)^4], \quad (83)$$

and we find two decoupled scalar fields. Therefore, λ_2 and λ_3 do not run independently with the cutoff if there is a symmetry that relates their strength to λ_1 .

The condition that a limited number of variables run with the cutoff does not only reveal symmetries broken by the regulator, it may also be used to uncover symmetries that are broken by the vacuum. Consider a scalar field theory with

$$V(\phi) = \frac{r\Lambda^2}{2}\phi^2 + \frac{g\Lambda}{3!}\phi^3 + \frac{\lambda}{4!}\phi^4 . \quad (84)$$

The renormalization group equations for this model depend on whether we normal-order the Hamiltonian, on whether we keep zero-modes in light-front field theory, etc. No physical result should depend on such choices, but the Hamiltonian itself is not physical. To be explicit, use a cutoff on Euclidean momenta, $q^2 < \Lambda^2$; and do not normal-order the Hamiltonian, since normal-ordering is not typically maintained by Euclidean renormalization group transformations. In this case, we must keep tadpole insertions coming from the ϕ^3 interaction and the renormalization group equations are

$$\frac{\partial r}{\partial t} = -2r - \zeta \frac{\lambda}{1+r} + \zeta \frac{g^2}{(1+r)^2} + \zeta \frac{g^2}{r(1+r)} + \mathcal{O}(2 \text{ loop}) , \quad (85)$$

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial t} = -g + 3\zeta \frac{\lambda g}{(1+r)^2} + \zeta \frac{\lambda g}{r(1+r)} + \mathcal{O}(2 \text{ loop}) , \quad (86)$$

$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial t} = 3\zeta \frac{\lambda^2}{(1+r)^2} + \mathcal{O}(2 \text{ loop}) . \quad (87)$$

Under what conditions is g a function of λ and r ? Substituting $g(\lambda, r)$ into Eq. (86) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[-2r - \zeta \frac{\lambda}{1+r} + \zeta \frac{g^2}{(1+r)^2} + \zeta \frac{g^2}{r(1+r)} \right] \frac{\partial g}{\partial r} + \left[3\zeta \frac{\lambda^2}{(1+r)^2} \right] \frac{\partial g}{\partial \lambda} \\ & = -g + 3\zeta \frac{\lambda g}{(1+r)^2} + \zeta \frac{\lambda g}{r(1+r)} . \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

If we allow g to depend explicitly on ζ (*i.e.*, explicitly on $\hbar$ in a loop expansion), we will find that $g(\lambda, r) = f(\lambda)\sqrt{r} + \mathcal{O}(\hbar)$ and $f(\lambda)$ will not be completely determined. However, if we insist that g contain no explicit dependence on ζ we find a unique solution, $g = \sqrt{3\lambda r}$. Using Eq. (84) we find that with this value of g ,

$$V(\psi) = \frac{\lambda}{4!} \left(\psi^2 - \frac{3r\Lambda^2}{\lambda} \right)^2 , \quad (89)$$

where $\psi = \phi + \sqrt{3r\Lambda^2/\lambda}$. In short we discover spontaneous symmetry breaking. In light-front Hamiltonian field theory it is natural to normal-order the Hamiltonian and drop all zero-modes, in which case the second and fourth terms on the right-hand side of Eq. (85), and the final term on the right-hand-side of Eq. (86) drop out. One can easily verify that the final result for g remains unchanged.

This last example is of some interest in light-front field theory, because it is difficult to reconcile vacuum symmetry breaking with the requirements that we work

with a trivial vacuum and drop zero-modes in practical non-perturbative Hamiltonian calculations. Of course, the only way that we can build vacuum symmetry breaking into the theory without including a nontrivial vacuum as part of the state vectors is to include symmetry breaking interactions in the Hamiltonian and work in the hidden symmetry phase. The problem then becomes one of finding all necessary operators without sacrificing predictive power. The renormalization group specifies what operators are relevant, marginal, and irrelevant; and coupling coherence provides one way to fix the strength of the symmetry-breaking interactions in terms of the symmetry-preserving interactions. This does not solve the problem of how to treat the vacuum in light-front QCD by any means, because we have only studied perturbation theory; but this result is encouraging and should motivate further investigation.

Hopefully these examples have clarified the use of coupling coherence. In calculations below coupling coherence is used to find the QED and QCD Hamiltonians to second order in the couplings, but before this can be done we need a renormalization group appropriate for light-front Hamiltonians. The first step is to define the renormalization group transformation, which is done in the next section.

8 The Similarity Transformation

Stan Glazek and Ken Wilson studied the problem of small energy denominators, which are already apparent in Wilson's first complete non-perturbative renormalization group calculations[44]. These problems plague most formalisms designed to produce effective Hamiltonians that can be used in model spaces, such as Bloch's method[17], where the problem is associated with 'intruder states.' Glazek and Wilson came up with a solution[15, 16]. Instead of truncating a theory by introducing a simple energy cutoff, which leads to pathological interactions in the effective Hamiltonian for states near the cutoff, they introduced cutoffs in the interactions that remove direct couplings between states that differ drastically in energy. This cutoff removes no states from the theory, so we still encounter the entire Fock space and must find approximations that employ a subspace.

In this section I want to give an oversimplified discussion of the similarity transformation, using sharp cutoffs that must eventually be replaced with smooth cutoffs that require a more complicated formalism. Glazek and Wilson have given a more complete discussion, and I refer the interested reader to their papers[15, 16].

Suppose we have a Hamiltonian,

$$H^{\Lambda_0} = H_0^{\Lambda_0} + V^{\Lambda_0} , \quad (90)$$

where $H_0^{\Lambda_0}$ is diagonal. The cutoff Λ_0 indicates that $\langle \phi_i | V^{\Lambda_0} | \phi_j \rangle = 0$ if $|E_{0i} - E_{0j}| > \Lambda_0$. I should note that Λ_0 is defined differently in this section from other sections. We want to use a similarity transformation, which automatically leaves all eigenvalues and other physical matrix elements invariant, that lowers this cutoff to Λ_1 . This

similarity transformation will constitute the first step in a renormalization group transformation, with the second step being a rescaling of energies that returns the cutoff to its original numerical value.

The transformed Hamiltonian is

$$H^{\Lambda_1} = e^{iR}(H_0^{\Lambda_0} + V^{\Lambda_0})e^{-iR}, \quad (91)$$

where R is a hermitian operator. If H^{Λ_0} is already diagonal, $R = 0$. Thus, if R has an expansion in powers of V , it starts at first order and we can expand the exponents in powers of R to find the perturbative approximation of the transformation.

We must adjust R so that the matrix elements of H^{Λ_1} vanish for all states that satisfy $\Lambda_1 < |E_{0i} - E_{0j}| < \Lambda_0$. We insist that this happens to each order in perturbation theory. Consider such a matrix element,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi_i | H^{\Lambda_1} | \phi_j \rangle &= \langle \phi_i | e^{iR} (H_0^{\Lambda_0} + V^{\Lambda_0}) e^{-iR} | \phi_j \rangle \\ &= \langle \phi_i | (1 + iR + \dots) (H_0^{\Lambda_0} + V^{\Lambda_0}) (1 - iR - \dots) | \phi_j \rangle \\ &= \langle \phi_i | H_0^{\Lambda_0} | \phi_j \rangle + \langle \phi_i | V^{\Lambda_0} + i[R, H_0^{\Lambda_0}] | \phi_j \rangle + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

The last line contains all terms that appear in first-order perturbation theory. Since $\langle \phi_i | H_0^{\Lambda_0} | \phi_j \rangle = 0$ for these off-diagonal matrix elements, we can satisfy our new constraint using

$$\langle \phi_i | R | \phi_j \rangle = \frac{i \langle \phi_i | V^{\Lambda_0} | \phi_j \rangle}{E_{0j} - E_{0i}} + \mathcal{O}(V^2). \quad (93)$$

This fixes the matrix elements of R when $\Lambda_1 < |E_{0i} - E_{0j}| < \Lambda_0$ to first order in V^{Λ_0} . I will assume that the matrix elements of R for $|E_{0i} - E_{0j}| < \Lambda_1$ are zero to first order in V , and fix these matrix elements to second order below.

Given R we can compute the nonzero matrix elements of H^{Λ_1} . To second order in V^{Λ_0} these are

$$\begin{aligned} H_{ab}^{\Lambda_1} &= \langle \phi_a | H_0 + V + i[R, H_0] + i[R, V] - \frac{1}{2} \{R^2, H_0\} + RH_0R + \mathcal{O}(V^3) | \phi_b \rangle \\ &= \langle \phi_a | H_0 + V + i[R_2, H_0] | \phi_b \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \Theta_{ak} \Theta_{kb} V_{ak} V_{kb} \left[\frac{1}{E_{0k} - E_{0a}} + \frac{1}{E_{0k} - E_{0b}} \right] \\ &\quad - \sum_k \left[\Theta_{ak} (1 - \Theta_{kb}) \frac{V_{ak} V_{kb}}{E_{0k} - E_{0a}} + \Theta_{kb} (1 - \Theta_{ak}) \frac{V_{ak} V_{kb}}{E_{0k} - E_{0b}} \right] + \mathcal{O}(V^3) \\ &= \langle \phi_a | H_0 + V + i[R_2, H_0] | \phi_b \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \Theta_{ak} \Theta_{kb} V_{ak} V_{kb} \left[\frac{1}{E_{0k} - E_{0a}} + \frac{1}{E_{0k} - E_{0b}} \right] \times \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\theta(|E_{0a} - E_{0k}| - |E_{0b} - E_{0k}|) - \theta(|E_{0b} - E_{0k}| - |E_{0a} - E_{0k}|) \right] \\
& - \sum_k V_{ak} V_{kb} \left[\Theta_{ak} \frac{\theta(|E_{0a} - E_{0k}| - |E_{0b} - E_{0k}|)}{E_{0k} - E_{0a}} + \right. \\
& \quad \left. \Theta_{kb} \frac{\theta(|E_{0b} - E_{0k}| - |E_{0a} - E_{0k}|)}{E_{0k} - E_{0b}} \right]. \tag{94}
\end{aligned}$$

I have dropped the Λ_0 superscript on the right-hand side of this equation and used subscripts to indicate matrix elements. The operator Θ_{ij} is one if $\Lambda_1 < |E_{0i} - E_{0j}| < \Lambda_0$ and zero otherwise. It should also be noted that V_{ij} is zero if $|E_{0i} - E_{0j}| > \Lambda_0$. All energy denominators involve energy differences that are at least as large as Λ_1 , and this feature persists to higher orders in perturbation theory; which is the main motivation for choosing this transformation. R_2 is second-order in V , and we are still free to choose its matrix elements; however, we must be careful not to introduce small energy denominators when choosing R_2 .¹

The matrix element $\langle \phi_a | i[R_2, H_0] | \phi_b \rangle = i(E_{0b} - E_{0a}) \langle \phi_a | R_2 | \phi_b \rangle$ must be specified. I will choose this matrix element to cancel the first sum in the final right-hand side of Eq. (94). The motivation for this choice will become clear later, after I introduce coupling coherence. At this order, the possibility of coupling coherence requires that the hamiltonian depend only on a single scale and not on the entire sequence of scales. For this to happen the sums that appear in the transformed hamiltonian must exactly complement sums that appeared in the initial interaction. Examples will clarify this point. To cancel the first sum in the final right-hand side of Eq. (94) requires

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \phi_a | R_2 | \phi_b \rangle &= \frac{i}{2} \sum_k \Theta_{ak} \Theta_{kb} V_{ak} V_{kb} \left[\frac{1}{E_{0k} - E_{0a}} + \frac{1}{E_{0k} - E_{0b}} \right] \times \\
& \left[\theta(|E_{0a} - E_{0k}| - |E_{0b} - E_{0k}|) - \theta(|E_{0b} - E_{0k}| - |E_{0a} - E_{0k}|) \right]. \tag{95}
\end{aligned}$$

This choice differs from the transformations given by Wilson and Glazek[15, 16, 14]. No small energy denominator appears in R_2 because it is being used to cancel a term that involves a large energy difference. If we tried to use R_2 to cancel the remaining sum also, we would find that it includes matrix elements that diverge as $E_{0a} - E_{0b}$ goes to zero, and this is not allowed.

The non-vanishing matrix elements of H^{Λ_1} are now completely determined to $\mathcal{O}(V^2)$,

¹In earlier versions of these lectures I made the mistake of choosing an R_2 that contains small energy denominators. This leads to errors throughout the original text, although all substantive results survive the correction.

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{ab}^{\Lambda_1} = & \langle \phi_a | H_0 + V^{\Lambda_0} | \phi_b \rangle \\
& - \sum_k V_{ak} V_{kb} \left[\Theta_{ak} \frac{\theta(|E_{0a} - E_{0k}| - |E_{0b} - E_{0k}|)}{E_{0k} - E_{0a}} + \right. \\
& \left. \Theta_{kb} \frac{\theta(|E_{0b} - E_{0k}| - |E_{0a} - E_{0k}|)}{E_{0k} - E_{0b}} \right]. \quad (96)
\end{aligned}$$

Let me again mention that $V_{ij}^{\Lambda_0}$ is zero if $|E_{0i} - E_{0j}| > \Lambda_0$, so there are implicit cutoffs that result from previous transformations.

As a final word of caution, I should mention that the use of step functions produces long-range pathologies in the interactions that lead to infrared divergences in gauge theories. One must replace the step functions with smooth functions to avoid this problem. This problem will not show up in any calculations in this paper.

Such expressions are common in many-body theory and this second-order result is quite simple. It is a straightforward exercise to invent diagrams that correspond to each term, but no one has reduced the calculation of the Hamiltonian to all orders to a set of diagrammatic rules.

Coupling coherence requires that the new Hamiltonian be identical to the original Hamiltonian at second order, except $\Lambda_0 \rightarrow \Lambda_1$; because running couplings do not affect this order. It is fairly easy to find at least two coupling coherent solutions to this order, and a higher order calculation is required to choose between them in principle. This issue will arise in the discussion of QED and QCD, where it is easily resolved without further calculations.

9 The Light-Front Renormalization Group

In this section I want to use the similarity transformation to form a perturbative light-front renormalization group for scalar field theory. Ideally we would begin with a set of rules for constructing Hamiltonians from derivatives and field operators, but the similarity transformation I have derived requires us to deal with matrix elements of the Hamiltonian. It is possible to write the Hamiltonian in terms of ‘free’ particle creation and annihilation operators. If we want to stay as close as possible to the canonical construction of field theories, we can:

- Write a set of ‘allowed’ operators using powers of derivatives and field operators.
- Introduce ‘free’ particle creation and annihilation operators, and expand all field operators in this basis.
- Introduce cutoffs on the Fock space transition operators.

Instead of following this program I will skip to the final step, and simply write a Hamiltonian to initiate the analysis.

$$\begin{aligned}
H = & \int d\tilde{q}_1 d\tilde{q}_2 (16\pi^3) \delta^3(q_1 - q_2) u_2(-q_1, q_2) a^\dagger(q_1) a(q_2) \\
& + \frac{1}{6} \int d\tilde{q}_1 d\tilde{q}_2 d\tilde{q}_3 d\tilde{q}_4 (16\pi^3) \delta^3(q_1 + q_2 + q_3 - q_4) \Theta(q_4^- - q_3^- - q_2^- - q_1^-) \\
& \quad u_4(-q_1, -q_2, -q_3, q_4) a^\dagger(q_1) a^\dagger(q_2) a^\dagger(q_3) a(q_4) \\
& + \frac{1}{4} \int d\tilde{q}_1 d\tilde{q}_2 d\tilde{q}_3 d\tilde{q}_4 (16\pi^3) \delta^3(q_1 + q_2 - q_3 - q_4) \Theta(q_4^- + q_3^- - q_2^- - q_1^-) \\
& \quad u_4(-q_1, -q_2, q_3, q_4) a^\dagger(q_1) a^\dagger(q_2) a(q_3) a(q_4) \\
& + \frac{1}{6} \int d\tilde{q}_1 d\tilde{q}_2 d\tilde{q}_3 d\tilde{q}_4 (16\pi^3) \delta^3(q_1 - q_2 - q_3 - q_4) \Theta(q_4^- + q_3^- + q_2^- - q_1^-) \\
& \quad u_4(-q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4) a^\dagger(q_1) a(q_2) a(q_3) a(q_4) \\
& + \mathcal{O}(\phi^6) ,
\end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

where,

$$d\tilde{q} = \frac{dq^+ d^2 q_\perp}{16\pi^3 q^+} , \tag{98}$$

$$q_i^- = \frac{q_{i\perp}^2}{q_i^+} , \tag{99}$$

and,

$$\Theta(Q^-) = \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} - |Q^-|\right) . \tag{100}$$

Here and below I simply assume that no operators appear that break the discrete $\phi \rightarrow -\phi$ symmetry. The functions u_2 and u_4 are not yet determined. If we assume locality in the transverse direction, these functions can be expanded in powers of their transverse momentum arguments. Note that to specify the cutoff both transverse and longitudinal momentum scales are required, and in this case the longitudinal momentum scale is independent of the particular state being studied. Note also that P^+ breaks longitudinal boost invariance and that a change in P^+ can be compensated by a change in Λ^2 . This may have important consequences, because the Hamiltonian should be a fixed point with respect to changes in the cutoff's longitudinal momentum scale, since this scale invariance is protected by Lorentz covariance[18].

I have specified the similarity transformation in terms of matrix elements, and will work directly with matrix elements, which are easily computed in the free particle Fock space basis. In order to study the renormalization group transformation I will assume that the Hamiltonian includes only the interactions shown above. A single transformation will produce a Hamiltonian containing products of arbitrarily

many creation and annihilation operators, but it is not necessary to understand the transformation in full detail.

I will *define* the full renormalization group transformation as: (i) a similarity transformation that lowers the cutoff in Θ , (ii) a rescaling of all transverse momenta that returns the cutoff to its original numerical value, (iii) a rescaling of the creation and annihilation operators by a constant factor ζ , and (iv) an overall constant rescaling of the Hamiltonian to absorb a multiplicative factor that results from the fact that it has the dimension of transverse momentum squared. These rescaling operations are introduced so that it may be possible to find a fixed point Hamiltonian. This rescaling operation will also allow us to directly compare the matrix elements of the transformed Hamiltonian with those of the original Hamiltonian and see why power counting reveals what operators are renormalizable in perturbation theory.

To find the critical Gaussian fixed point we need to study the linearized approximation of the full transformation, as discussed in the section on Wilson's renormalization group. In general the linearized approximation can be extremely complicated, but near a critical Gaussian fixed point it is particularly simple in light-front field theory with zero modes removed, because tadpoles are excluded. We have already seen that the similarity transformation does not produce any first order change in the Hamiltonian, so the first order change is determined entirely by the rescaling operation. If we let

$$\Lambda_1 = \eta \Lambda_0 , \quad (101)$$

$$\mathbf{p}_{i\perp} = \eta \mathbf{p}'_{i\perp} , \quad (102)$$

and,

$$a_p = \zeta a_{p'} , \quad a_p^\dagger = \zeta a_{p'}^\dagger , \quad (103)$$

to first order the transformed Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{aligned} H = & \quad \zeta^2 \int d\tilde{q}_1 d\tilde{q}_2 (16\pi^3) \delta^3(q_1 - q_2) u_2(q_i^+, \eta q_i^\perp) a^\dagger(q_1) a(q_2) \\ & + \frac{1}{6} \eta^4 \zeta^4 \int d\tilde{q}_1 d\tilde{q}_2 d\tilde{q}_3 d\tilde{q}_4 (16\pi^3) \delta^3(q_1 + q_2 + q_3 - q_4) \Theta(q_4^- - q_3^- - q_2^- - q_1^-) \\ & \quad u_4(q_i^+, \eta q_i^\perp) a^\dagger(q_1) a^\dagger(q_2) a^\dagger(q_3) a(q_4) \\ & + \frac{1}{4} \eta^4 \zeta^4 \int d\tilde{q}_1 d\tilde{q}_2 d\tilde{q}_3 d\tilde{q}_4 (16\pi^3) \delta^3(q_1 + q_2 - q_3 - q_4) \Theta(q_4^- + q_3^- - q_2^- - q_1^-) \\ & \quad u_4(q_i^+, \eta q_i^\perp) a^\dagger(q_1) a^\dagger(q_2) a(q_3) a(q_4) \\ & + \frac{1}{6} \eta^4 \zeta^4 \int d\tilde{q}_1 d\tilde{q}_2 d\tilde{q}_3 d\tilde{q}_4 (16\pi^3) \delta^3(q_1 - q_2 - q_3 - q_4) \Theta(q_4^- + q_3^- + q_2^- - q_1^-) \\ & \quad u_4(q_i^+, \eta q_i^\perp) a^\dagger(q_1) a(q_2) a(q_3) a(q_4) \\ & + \quad \mathcal{O}(\phi^6) , \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

where I have simplified my notation for the arguments appearing in the functions u_i . An overall factor of η^2 that results from the engineering dimension of the Hamiltonian has been removed. The Gaussian fixed point is found by insisting that the first term remains constant, which requires

$$\zeta^2 u_2^*(q^+, \eta \mathbf{q}_\perp) = u_2^*(q^+, \mathbf{q}_\perp) . \quad (105)$$

I have used the fact that u_2 actually depends on only one momentum other than the cutoff.

The solution to this equation is a monomial in $\mathbf{q}_\perp$ which depends on ζ ,

$$u_2^*(q^+, \mathbf{q}_\perp) = f(q^+) (\mathbf{q}_\perp)^n , \quad \zeta = \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \right)^{(n/2)} . \quad (106)$$

The solution depends on our choice of n and to obtain the appropriate free particle dispersion relation we need to choose $n = 2$, so that

$$u_2^*(q^+, \mathbf{q}_\perp) = f(q^+) \mathbf{q}_\perp^2 , \quad \zeta = \frac{1}{\eta} . \quad (107)$$

$f(q^+)$ is allowed because the cutoff scale P^+ allows us to form the dimensionless variable q^+/P^+ , which can enter the one-body operator. We will see that this happens in QED and QCD. Note that the constant in front of each four-point interaction becomes one, so that their scaling behavior is determined entirely by u_4 . If we insist on transverse locality (which may be violated because we remove zero modes), we can expand u_4 in powers of its transverse momentum arguments, and discover powers of $\eta q_i^\perp$ in the transformed Hamiltonian. Since we are lowering the cutoff, $\eta < 1$, and each power of transverse momentum will be suppressed by this factor. This means increasing powers of transverse momentum are increasingly *irrelevant*, as defined in the section on Wilson's renormalization group.

I will not go through a complete derivation of the eigenoperators of the linearized approximation to the renormalization group transformation about the critical Gaussian fixed point, but the derivation is simple[18]. Increasing powers of transverse derivatives and increasing powers of creation and annihilation operators lead to increasingly irrelevant operators. The irrelevant operators are called 'non-renormalizable' in old-fashioned Feynman perturbation theory. Their magnitude decreases at an exponential rate as the cutoff is lowered, which means that they *increase* at an exponential rate as the cutoff is raised and produce increasingly large divergences if we try to follow their evolution perturbatively in this exponentially unstable direction.

The only relevant operator is the mass operator,

$$\mu^2 \int d\tilde{q}_1 d\tilde{q}_2 (16\pi^3) \delta^3(q_1 - q_2) a^\dagger(q_1) a(q_2) , \quad (108)$$

while the fixed point Hamiltonian is marginal (of course), and the operator in which $u_4 = \lambda$ (a constant) is marginal. A ϕ^3 operator would also be relevant.

The next logical step in a renormalization group analysis is to study the transformation to second order in the interaction, keeping the second-order corrections from the similarity transformation. I will compute the correction to u_2 to this order and refer the interested reader to Ref. [18] for more complicated examples. However, I warn the reader that in this reference a Bloch transformation is used, which leads to pathologies apparently not produced by the similarity transformation.

The matrix element of the one-body operator between single particle states is

$$\langle p' | h | p \rangle = \langle 0 | a(p') h a^\dagger(p) | 0 \rangle = (16\pi^3) \delta^3(p' - p) u_2(-p, p). \quad (109)$$

Thus, we easily determine u_2 from the matrix element. It is easy to compute matrix elements between other states. We computed the matrix elements of the effective Hamiltonian generated by the similarity transformation when the cutoff is lowered in Eq. (96), and now we want to compute the second-order term generated by the four-point interactions above. There are additional corrections to u_2 at second-order in the interaction if u_6 , *etc.* are nonzero.

Before rescaling we find that the transformed Hamiltonian contains

$$\begin{aligned} (16\pi^3) \delta^3(p' - p) \delta v_2(-p, p) = \\ \frac{1}{3!} \int d\tilde{k}_1 d\tilde{k}_2 d\tilde{k}_3 \theta(\Lambda_0 - |p^- - k_1^- - k_2^- - k_3^-|) \\ \theta(|p^- - k_1^- - k_2^- - k_3^-| - \eta\Lambda_0) \frac{\langle p' | V | k_1, k_2, k_3 \rangle \langle k_1, k_2, k_3 | V | p \rangle}{p^- - k_1^- - k_2^- - k_3^-}, \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

where $p^- = \mathbf{p}_\perp^2/p^+$, *etc.* One can readily verify that

$$\langle p' | V | k_1, k_2, k_3 \rangle = (16\pi^3) \delta^3(p' - k_1 - k_2 - k_3) \Theta(p^- - k_1^- - k_2^- - k_3^-) u_4(-p', k_1, k_2, k_3), \quad (111)$$

$$\langle k_1, k_2, k_3 | V | p \rangle = (16\pi^3) \delta^3(p - k_1 - k_2 - k_3) \Theta(p^- - k_1^- - k_2^- - k_3^-) u_4(-k_1, -k_2, -k_3, p). \quad (112)$$

This leads to the result,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta v_2(-p, p) = & \frac{1}{3!} \int d\tilde{k}_1 d\tilde{k}_2 d\tilde{k}_3 (16\pi^3) \delta^3(p - k_1 - k_2 - k_3) \\ & \theta(\Lambda_0 - |p^- - k_1^- - k_2^- - k_3^-|) \theta(|p^- - k_1^- - k_2^- - k_3^-| - \eta\Lambda_0) \\ & \frac{u_4(-p, k_1, k_2, k_3) u_4(-k_1, -k_2, -k_3, p)}{p^- - k_1^- - k_2^- - k_3^-}. \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

To obtain δu_2 from δv_2 we must rescale the momenta, the fields, and the Hamiltonian. The final result is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta u_2(-p, p) = & \frac{1}{3!} \int d\tilde{k}_1 d\tilde{k}_2 d\tilde{k}_3 (16\pi^3) \delta^3(p - k_1 - k_2 - k_3) \\ & \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda_0}{\eta} - |p^- - k_1^- - k_2^- - k_3^-|\right) \theta(|p^- - k_1^- - k_2^- - k_3^-| - \Lambda_0) \\ & \frac{u_4(p', k'_1, k'_2, k'_3) u_4(-k'_1, -k'_2, -k'_3, p')}{p^- - k_1^- - k_2^- - k_3^-}, \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

where $p^{+'} = p^+$, $p^{\perp'} = \eta p^\perp$, $k_i^{+'} = k_i^+$, and $k_i^{\perp'} = \eta k_i^\perp$.

10 QED and QCD Hamiltonians

This is a dull section filled with details. I follow the pioneering work of Brodsky and Lepage (see the references in [9]) to develop a canonical QCD Hamiltonian (from which it is easy to determine the QED Hamiltonian), and provide many details required to use it. My derivation is not intended to be rigorous, and there is no discussion of constrained quantization or gauge fixing of zero modes.

Before proceeding, let me mention that if we start with a Hamiltonian that includes the free quark and gluon kinetic energies, and the quark-gluon vertex alone, it is possible to derive the rest of the canonical Hamiltonian using coupling coherence. This is not an easy task, but one finds that the three- and four-gluon interactions, as well as the instantaneous gluon exchange interactions and suitably defined self-induced inertias, must be added or new couplings and masses in addition to the canonical coupling appear and run independently with the cutoff. Of course, it is easiest to start with all terms in the canonical Hamiltonian through $\mathcal{O}(g)$, because non-canonical counterterms appear at $\mathcal{O}(g^2)$ and must be determined by non-canonical means in any case.

I repeat my recommendation of the papers by Zhang and Harindranath[12], where elegant techniques for constrained quantization developed by Faddeev and Jackiw[45] are used to derive a formal expression for the QCD Hamiltonian, taking special care to discuss infrared divergences. They use a chiral representation of the Dirac gamma matrices, which is particularly well-suited to the isolation of the two dynamical components of Dirac spinors; and they provide many example one-loop calculations that are useful to anyone who wants to start doing light-front calculations. Perhaps the first useful discussion of non-covariant divergences and counterterms is provided by Charles Thorn (see Thorn's paper in [9]) in his paper on asymptotic freedom in light-cone gauge. His work has not received the attention that it deserves. For a recent discussion of the counterterms required to restore covariance and gauge invariance in QED, see the paper by Mustaki, Pinsky, Shigemitsu, and Wilson[10]. Of course, the work of Brodsky and Lepage is also a useful starting point.

I will use $A^+ = 0$ gauge, and since I drop zero modes I do not directly confront the fact that this condition cannot be implemented for gauge field zero modes. I use the Bjorken and Drell conventions for gamma matrices[46], largely because these are the conventions I have used until recently in my calculations. The gamma matrices are

$$\gamma^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma^k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma_k \\ -\sigma_k & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (115)$$

where σ_k are the Pauli matrices. This leads to

$$\gamma^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sigma_3 \\ -\sigma_3 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma^- = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\sigma_3 \\ \sigma_3 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (116)$$

Useful identities for many calculations are $\gamma^+\gamma^-\gamma^+ = 4\gamma^+$, and $\gamma^-\gamma^+\gamma^- = 4\gamma^-$.

The operator that projects onto the dynamical fermion degree of freedom is

$$\Lambda_+ = \frac{1}{2}\gamma^0\gamma^+ = \frac{1}{4}\gamma^-\gamma^+ = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sigma_3 \\ \sigma_3 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (117)$$

and the complement projection operator is

$$\Lambda_- = \frac{1}{2}\gamma^0\gamma^- = \frac{1}{4}\gamma^+\gamma^- = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\sigma_3 \\ -\sigma_3 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (118)$$

The Dirac spinors $u(p, \sigma)$ and $v(p, \sigma)$ satisfy

$$(\not{p} - m)u(p, \sigma) = 0, \quad (\not{p} + m)v(p, \sigma) = 0, \quad (119)$$

and,

$$\bar{u}(p, \sigma)u(p, \sigma') = -\bar{v}(p, \sigma)v(p, \sigma') = 2m\delta_{\sigma\sigma'}, \quad (120)$$

$$\bar{u}(p, \sigma)\gamma^\mu u(p, \sigma') = \bar{v}(p, \sigma)\gamma^\mu v(p, \sigma') = 2p^\mu\delta_{\sigma\sigma'}, \quad (121)$$

$$\sum_{\sigma=\pm\frac{1}{2}} u(p, \sigma)\bar{u}(p, \sigma) = \not{p} + m, \quad \sum_{\sigma=\pm\frac{1}{2}} v(p, \sigma)\bar{v}(p, \sigma) = \not{p} - m. \quad (122)$$

There are only two physical gluon (photon) polarization vectors, $\epsilon_{1\perp}$ and $\epsilon_{2\perp}$; but it is sometimes convenient (and dangerous once covariance and gauge invariance are violated) to use ϵ^μ , where

$$\epsilon^+ = 0, \quad \epsilon^- = \frac{2\mathbf{q}_\perp \cdot \epsilon_\perp}{q^+}. \quad (123)$$

It is often possible to avoid using an explicit representation for $\epsilon_\perp$, but completeness relations are required,

$$\sum_{\lambda} \epsilon_{\perp}^{\mu}(\lambda) \epsilon_{\perp}^{*\nu}(\lambda) = -g_{\perp}^{\mu\nu} , \quad (124)$$

so that,

$$\sum_{\lambda} \epsilon^{\mu}(\lambda) \epsilon^{*\nu}(\lambda) = -g_{\perp}^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{q^{+}}(\eta^{\mu} q_{\perp}^{\nu} + \eta^{\nu} q_{\perp}^{\mu}) + \frac{\mathbf{q}_{\perp}^2}{(q^{+})^2} \eta^{\mu} \eta^{\nu} , \quad (125)$$

where $\eta^{+} = \eta^1 = \eta^2 = 0$ and $\eta^{-} = 2$. One often encounters diagrammatic rules in which the gauge propagator is written so that it looks covariant; but this is dangerous in loop calculations because such expressions require one to add and subtract terms that contain severe infrared divergences.

The QCD Lagrangian density is

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} + \bar{\psi} (i \not{D} - m) \psi , \quad (126)$$

where $F^{\mu\nu} = \partial^{\mu} A^{\nu} - \partial^{\nu} A^{\mu} + ig[A^{\mu}, A^{\nu}]$ and $iD^{\mu} = i\partial^{\mu} - gA^{\mu}$. The SU(3) gauge fields are $A^{\mu} = \sum_a A_a^{\mu} T^a$, where T^a are one-half the Gell-Mann matrices, λ^a , and satisfy $\text{Tr} T^a T^b = 1/2 \delta^{ab}$ and $[T^a, T^b] = if^{abc} T^c$.

The dynamical fermion degree of freedom is $\psi_{+} = \Lambda_{+} \psi$, and this can be expanded in terms of plane wave creation and annihilation operators at $x^{+} = 0$,

$$\psi_{+}^r(x) = \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1/2} \int_{k^{+}>0} \frac{dk^{+} d^2 k_{\perp}}{16\pi^3 k^{+}} \left[b^r(k, \sigma) u_{+}(k, \sigma) e^{-ik \cdot x} + d^{r\dagger}(k, \sigma) v_{+}(k, \sigma) e^{ik \cdot x} \right] , \quad (127)$$

where these field operators satisfy

$$\left\{ \psi_{+}^r(x), \psi_{+}^{s\dagger}(y) \right\}_{x^{+}=y^{+}=0} = \Lambda_{+} \delta_{rs} \delta^3(x - y) , \quad (128)$$

and the creation and annihilation operators satisfy

$$\left\{ b^r(k, \sigma), b^{s\dagger}(p, \sigma') \right\} = \left\{ d^r(k, \sigma), d^{s\dagger}(p, \sigma') \right\} = 16\pi^3 k^{+} \delta_{rs} \delta_{\sigma\sigma'} \delta^3(k - p) . \quad (129)$$

The indices r and s refer to SU(3) color. In general, when momenta are listed without specification of components, as in $\delta^3(p)$, I am referring to p^{+} and $\mathbf{p}_{\perp}$.

The transverse dynamical gluon field components can also be expanded in terms of plane wave creation and annihilation operators,

$$A_{\perp}^{ic}(x) = \sum_{\lambda} \int_{k^{+}>0} \frac{dk^{+} d^2 k_{\perp}}{16\pi^3 k^{+}} \left[a^c(k, \lambda) \epsilon_{\perp}^i(\lambda) e^{-ik \cdot x} + a^{c\dagger}(k, \lambda) \epsilon_{\perp}^{i*}(\lambda) e^{ik \cdot x} \right] . \quad (130)$$

The superscript i refers to the transverse dimensions x and y , and the superscript c is for SU(3) color. If required the physical polarization vector can be represented

$$\epsilon_{\perp}(\uparrow) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1, i), \quad \epsilon_{\perp}(\downarrow) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1, -i). \quad (131)$$

The quantization conditions are

$$\left[A_{\perp}^{ic}(x), \partial^+ A_{\perp}^{jd}(y) \right]_{x^+=y^+=0} = i\delta^{ij}\delta_{cd}\delta^3(x-y), \quad (132)$$

$$\left[a^c(k, \lambda), a^{d\dagger}(p, \lambda') \right] = 16\pi^3 k^+ \delta_{\lambda\lambda'} \delta_{cd} \delta^3(k-p). \quad (133)$$

The classical equations for $\psi_- = \Lambda_- \psi$ and A^- do not involve time-derivatives, so these variables can be eliminated in favor of dynamical degrees of freedom. This formally yields

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_- &= \frac{1}{i\partial^+} \left[i\alpha_{\perp} \cdot \mathbf{D}_{\perp} + \beta m \right] \psi_+ \\ &= \tilde{\psi}_- - \frac{g}{i\partial^+} \alpha_{\perp} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{\perp} \psi_+, \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

where the variable $\tilde{\psi}_-$ is defined on the second line to separate the interaction-dependent part of ψ_- ; and

$$\begin{aligned} A^{a-} &= \frac{2}{i\partial^+} i\partial_{\perp} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{\perp}^a + \frac{2igf^{abc}}{(i\partial^+)^2} \left\{ (i\partial^+ A_{\perp}^{bi}) A_{\perp}^{ci} + 2\psi_+^{\dagger} T^a \psi_+ \right\} \\ &= \tilde{A}^{a-} + \frac{2igf^{abc}}{(i\partial^+)^2} \left\{ (i\partial^+ A_{\perp}^{bi}) A_{\perp}^{ci} + 2\psi_+^{\dagger} T^a \psi_+ \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (135)$$

where the variable $\tilde{A}^-$ is defined on the second line to separate the interaction-dependent part of A^- .

Given these replacements, we can follow a canonical procedure to determine the Hamiltonian. This path is full of difficulties that I ignore, because ultimately I will use coupling coherence to refine the definition of the Hamiltonian and determine the non-canonical interactions that are inevitably produced by the violation of explicit covariance and gauge invariance. For my purposes it is sufficient to write down a Hamiltonian that can serve as a starting point:

$$H = H_0 + V, \quad (136)$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &= \int d^3x \left\{ \text{Tr}(\partial_{\perp}^i A_{\perp}^j \partial_{\perp}^i A_{\perp}^j) + \psi_+^{\dagger} (i\alpha_{\perp}^i \partial_{\perp}^i + \beta m) \psi_+ \right\} \\ &= \sum_{\text{colors}} \int \frac{dk^+ d^2k_{\perp}}{16\pi^3 k^+} \left\{ \sum_{\lambda} \frac{\mathbf{k}_{\perp}^2}{k^+} a^{\dagger}(k, \lambda) a(k, \lambda) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{\sigma} \frac{\mathbf{k}_{\perp}^2 + m^2}{k^+} (b^{\dagger}(k, \sigma) b(k, \sigma) + d^{\dagger}(k, \sigma) d(k, \sigma)) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (137)$$

In the last line the ‘self-induced inertias’ (*i.e.*, one-body operators produced by normal-ordering V) are not included. It is difficult to regulate the field contraction encountered in normal-ordering in a manner exactly consistent with the cutoff regulation of contractions encountered later. Coupling coherence avoids this issue and produces the correct one-body counterterms with no discussion of normal-ordering required.

The interactions are complicated and are most easily written using the variables, $\tilde{\psi} = \tilde{\psi}_- + \psi_+$, and $\tilde{A}$, where $\tilde{A}^+ = 0$, $\tilde{A}^-$ is defined above, and $\tilde{A}_\perp^i = A_\perp^i$. Using these variables we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V = \int d^3x \Bigg\{ & g \bar{\tilde{\psi}} \gamma_\mu \tilde{A}^\mu \tilde{\psi} + 2g \operatorname{Tr} \left(i \partial^\mu \tilde{A}^\nu [\tilde{A}_\mu, \tilde{A}_\nu] \right) \\
& - \frac{g^2}{2} \operatorname{Tr} \left([\tilde{A}^\mu, \tilde{A}^\nu] [\tilde{A}_\mu, \tilde{A}_\nu] \right) + g^2 \bar{\tilde{\psi}} \gamma_\mu \tilde{A}^\mu \frac{\gamma^+}{2i\partial^+} \gamma_\nu \tilde{A}^\nu \tilde{\psi} \\
& + \frac{g^2}{2} \bar{\tilde{\psi}} \gamma^+ T^a \psi \frac{1}{(i\partial^+)^2} \bar{\tilde{\psi}} \gamma^+ T^a \psi \\
& - g^2 \bar{\tilde{\psi}} \gamma^+ \left(\frac{1}{(i\partial^+)^2} [i\partial^+ \tilde{A}^\mu, \tilde{A}_\mu] \right) \psi \\
& + g^2 \operatorname{Tr} \left([i\partial^+ \tilde{A}^\mu, \tilde{A}_\mu] \frac{1}{(i\partial^+)^2} [i\partial^+ \tilde{A}^\nu, \tilde{A}_\nu] \right) \Bigg\}. \quad (138)
\end{aligned}$$

The commutators in this expression are SU(3) commutators only. The potential algebraic complexity of calculations becomes apparent when one systematically expands every term in V and replaces:

$$\tilde{\psi}^- \rightarrow \frac{1}{i\partial^+} (i\alpha_\perp \cdot \partial_\perp + \beta m) \psi_+, \quad (139)$$

$$\tilde{A}^- \rightarrow \frac{2}{i\partial^+} i\partial_\perp \cdot \mathbf{A}_\perp; \quad (140)$$

and then expands ψ_+ and $\mathbf{A}_\perp$ in terms of creation and annihilation operators. It rapidly becomes evident that one should avoid such explicit expansions if possible.

11 Positronium: QED in 3+1 Dimensions

In this section I finally come to a ‘new’ calculation, although my goals are quite modest. I will first outline a procedure that can be used to compute the masses and eigenstates of QED bound states to arbitrarily high accuracy (in principle). I will then show that the leading result for the binding energy of positronium is exactly the Bohr energy, and that the necessary Coulomb interaction is automatically produced as a two-body interaction by the similarity transformation and coupling coherence.

The leading results for positronium in light-front QED have already been obtained by others. Brodsky, Pauli, and Tang[47] showed how to set up the positronium bound state problem in DLCQ with a Tamm-Dancoff truncation[48] to two sectors of Fock space: (i) the electron-positron sector, and (ii) the electron-positron-photon sector. Krautgartner, Pauli, and Wolz[49] derived the nonrelativistic continuum limit for the calculation analytically, and with a prescription for handling an infrared divergence they showed that to leading order the binding energy for positronium results. Kaluza and Pauli[50] showed that reasonably accurate numerical results can be obtained with proper renormalization of the Hamiltonian, although logarithmic ‘divergences’ remain in their calculations. The divergences that remain are four-fermion interactions which are sector-dependent[48]. These divergences are not a serious problem if one uses a sufficiently small cutoff, weak coupling, and does not seek precise answers. Kaluza and Pirner[51] extended the work in Ref. [49] through the fine structure.

There are no doubt references that I have missed, and Brodsky and Lepage certainly understood the important ingredients for a light-front positronium calculation long ago.

Several important ingredients for an ‘all-orders’ calculation are missing or not clear in the above work. First, no general method for computing non-canonical counterterms is given, and as one consequence sector-dependent coupling counterterms due to the Tamm-Dancoff truncation are sometimes missed (see [52] for a good discussion of the problems). Second, when the DLCQ calculations were used to derive an integral equation for the electron-positron bound state in the continuum limit[49], the full energy appeared in the interaction kernel and had to be replaced by hand with a free energy to avoid new infrared divergences. It was not clear how to carry this prescription to higher orders. Nonetheless, the DLCQ calculations have laid the groundwork upon which my calculations are based; and to the order I work in this paper the differences are not important.

The small new step taken here is the use of a renormalization group computational framework that produces the ‘leading’ result (*i.e.*, the Bohr energy) and indicates how to systematically improve this result.

The first step is to compute a renormalized cutoff Hamiltonian as a power series in the coupling e . Starting with the canonical Hamiltonian as a ‘seed,’ this is done with the similarity renormalization group[15, 16] and coupling coherence[19, 18]. The result is an apparently unique perturbative series,

$$H_N^\Lambda = h_0 + e_\Lambda h_1 + e_\Lambda^2 h_2 + \cdots + e_\Lambda^N h_N . \quad (141)$$

If we use the resultant Hamiltonian to compute scattering observables to $\mathcal{O}(e^N)$, they should respect all symmetries of Lagrangian perturbation theory such as Lorentz covariance and gauge invariance (for gauge invariant matrix elements). This has not been proven to all orders, but I have found no exceptions.

Here e_Λ is the running coupling constant, and all remaining dependence on Λ in the operators h_i must be explicit. In principle I must also treat m_Λ , the electron

running mass, as an independent function of Λ ; but this will not affect the results to the order I compute here. We must calculate the Hamiltonian to a fixed order, and systematically improve the calculation later by including higher order terms. This starting point should be completely adequate for QED, but must be refined for QCD to include non-perturbative condensate effects; because it will never produce a chiral-symmetry breaking operator, for example.

Having obtained the Hamiltonian to some order in e , the next step is to split it into two parts,

$$H^\Lambda = \mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda + \mathcal{V}^\Lambda. \quad (142)$$

As discussed before, $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ must be accurately solved non-perturbatively, producing a zeroth order approximation for the eigenvalues and eigenstates. The greatest ambiguities in the calculation appear in the choice of $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$, which requires one of science's most powerful computational tools, trial and error.

In QED and QCD I assume that all interactions in $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ preserve particle number, with all interactions that involve particle creation and annihilation in $\mathcal{V}^\Lambda$. This assumption is consistent with the original hypothesis that a constituent picture will emerge, but it should emerge as a valid approximation.

The final step before the loop is repeated, starting with a more accurate approximation for H^Λ , is to compute corrections from $\mathcal{V}^\Lambda$ in bound state perturbation theory. There is no reason to compute these corrections to arbitrarily high order, because the initial Hamiltonian contains errors that limit the accuracy we can obtain in bound state perturbation theory.

One test of the choice of $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ is provided by the cutoff. If an exact calculation were performed the results would be independent of Λ ; but the truncation of the series for H^Λ and the non-perturbative behavior of $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ will introduce Λ dependence. For example, if the cutoff is extremely large and $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ does not include any operators involving photon emission and absorption, the zeroth order bound state calculations will contain arbitrarily large errors. If the cutoff is made too small (*e.g.*, much smaller than αm in QED), arbitrarily large errors will also result. The study of these errors is both interesting and important, but I will have little more to say here.

In this section I: (i) compute H^Λ to $\mathcal{O}(e^2)$, (ii) assume the cutoff to be $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^{3/4}m)$ for non-perturbative analyses, (iii) include the most infrared singular two-body interactions in $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$, and (iv) estimate the binding energy for positronium to $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^2m)$.

In QED the natural low-energy transverse momentum scale emerges easily in a renormalization group analysis, because it is set by the electron mass when the coupling is small. In QCD it is not obvious how the scale Λ_{QCD} emerges, and it is easiest to assume that this happens and use the resultant non-perturbative scaling properties of the theory near Λ_{QCD} to justify the assumption *a posteriori*.

Since $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ is assumed to include interactions that preserve particle number, the zeroth order positronium ground state will be a pure electron-positron state. We only need one- and two-body interactions; *i.e.*, the electron self-energy and the electron-

positron interaction. The canonical interactions can be found in Eq. (138), and the second-order change in the Hamiltonian is given in Eq. (96). The shift due to the bare electron mixing with electron-photon states to lowest order is

$$\delta\Sigma_p = e^2 \int \frac{dk_1^+ d^2k_{1\perp}}{16\pi^3} \frac{\theta(k_1^+) \theta(k_2^+)}{k_1^+ k_2^+} \frac{\bar{u}(p) D_{\mu\nu}(k_1) \gamma^\mu (\not{k}_2 + m) \gamma^\nu u(p)}{p^- - k_1^- - k_2^-}, \quad (143)$$

where,

$$k_2^+ = p^+ - k_1^+, \quad \mathbf{k}_{2\perp} = \mathbf{p}_\perp - \mathbf{k}_{1\perp}, \quad (144)$$

$$k_i^- = \frac{k_{i\perp}^2 + m_i^2}{k_i^+}, \quad (145)$$

$$D_{\mu\nu}(k) = -g_{\perp\mu\nu} + \frac{k_\perp^2}{(k^+)^2} \eta_\mu \eta_\nu + \frac{1}{k^+} (k_{\perp\mu} \eta_\nu + k_{\perp\nu} \eta_\mu), \quad (146)$$

$$\eta_\mu a^\mu = a^+. \quad (147)$$

I have not yet displayed the cutoffs. To evaluate the integrals it is easiest to use Jacobi variables x and $\mathbf{s}$ for the relative electron-photon motion,

$$k_1^+ = xp^+, \quad \mathbf{k}_{1\perp} = x\mathbf{p}_\perp + \mathbf{s}, \quad (148)$$

which implies

$$k_2^+ = (1-x)p^+, \quad \mathbf{k}_{2\perp} = (1-x)\mathbf{p}_\perp - \mathbf{s}. \quad (149)$$

The second-order change in the electron self-energy becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\Sigma_p = & -\frac{e_\Lambda^2}{p^+} \int \frac{dx d^2s}{16\pi^3} \theta\left(y\Lambda_0^2 - \frac{s^2 + x^2 m^2}{x(1-x)}\right) \theta\left(\frac{s^2 + x^2 m^2}{x(1-x)} - y\Lambda_1^2\right) \\ & \left(\frac{1}{s^2 + x^2 m^2}\right) \bar{u}(p, \sigma) \left\{ 2(1-x) \not{s} - 2m + \right. \\ & \left. \frac{\gamma^+}{p^+} \left[\frac{2s^2}{x^2} + \frac{2s^2}{1-x} + \frac{x(2-x)m^2}{1-x} \right] \right\} u(p, \sigma), \quad (150) \end{aligned}$$

where $y = p^+/P^+$.

Our choice of a cutoff that depends on light-front free energies was dictated by the desire to avoid introducing spectator dependence and to produce a well-behaved perturbative expansion for the transformed Hamiltonian. This forces us to introduce a scale, Λ^2/P^+ , and P^+ violates explicit longitudinal boost covariance.

It is straightforward in this case to determine the self-energy required by coupling coherence. Since the electron-photon coupling does not run until third order, to second order the self-energy must exactly reproduce itself with $\Lambda_0 \rightarrow \Lambda_1$. For the self-energy to be finite we must assume that $\delta\Sigma$ reduces a positive self-energy, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{coh}^\Lambda(p) &= \frac{e_\Lambda^2}{p^+} \int \frac{dx d^2s}{16\pi^3} \theta(yx - \epsilon) \theta\left(y\Lambda^2 - \frac{s^2 + x^2 m^2}{x(1-x)}\right) \left(\frac{1}{s^2 + x^2 m^2}\right) \\
&\quad \bar{u}(p, \sigma) \left\{ 2(1-x) \not{p} - 2m + \frac{\gamma^+}{p^+} \left[\frac{2s^2}{x^2} + \frac{2s^2}{1-x} + \frac{x(2-x)m^2}{1-x} \right] \right\} u(p, \sigma) \\
&= \frac{e_\Lambda^2}{8\pi^2 p^+} \left\{ 2y\Lambda^2 \ln\left(\frac{y^2\Lambda^2}{(y\Lambda^2 + m^2)\epsilon}\right) - \frac{3}{2}y\Lambda^2 + \frac{1}{2}\frac{ym^2\Lambda^2}{y\Lambda^2 + m^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 3m^2 \ln\left(\frac{m^2}{y\Lambda^2 + m^2}\right) \right\} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon/y) . \tag{151}
\end{aligned}$$

I have been forced to introduce *a second cutoff*,

$$xp^+ > \epsilon P^+ , \tag{152}$$

because after the $\mathbf{s}$ integration is completed we are left with a logarithmically divergent x integration. Other choices for this second infrared cutoff are possible and lead to similar results. I believe that these additional $\ln(\epsilon)$ divergences occur only when a photon is emitted and absorbed in immediately successive vertices. In other words, they resemble super-renormalizable divergences, which can be renormalized non-perturbatively. However, I do not subtract these divergences.

The electron and photon (quark and gluon) ‘mass’ operators, are a function of a longitudinal momentum scale introduced by the cutoff, and there is an exact scale invariance required by longitudinal boost invariance. Here I mean by ‘mass operator’ the one-body operator when the transverse momentum is zero, even though this does not agree with the free mass operator because it includes longitudinal momentum dependence. The cutoff violates boost invariance and the mass operator is required to restore the symmetry. The only local scale is the parton longitudinal momentum, p^+ ; and the bare mass term scales as $1/p^+$. There is not always a single particle that naturally sets the scale for a global cutoff. A mass term that scales as $1/p^+$ causes wee partons to decouple from valence partons, and removes the infrared singularities from QCD[14]. My simple confinement mechanism requires these infrared singularities to cancel rather than disappear, and it is important that the gluon ‘mass’ scales as $1/P^+$ where P^+ is a scale fixed by the cutoff and might be chosen to be the total longitudinal momentum of the state. Physical results cannot depend on the cutoff scale, so the natural scale for single hadron problems is the momentum of the hadron.

We must interpret this new infrared divergence, because we have no choice about whether it is in the Hamiltonian if we use coupling coherence. We can only choose

between putting the divergent operator in $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ or in $\mathcal{V}^\Lambda$. I make different choices in QED and QCD, and the arguments are based on physics.

This divergent electron ‘mass’ is a complete lie. We encounter a term proportional to $e_\Lambda^2 \Lambda^2 \ln(1/\epsilon)/P^+$ when the scale is Λ ; however, we can reduce this scale as far as we please in perturbation theory. Photons are massless, so the electron will continue to dress itself with small- x photons to arbitrarily small Λ . Since I believe that this divergent self-energy is exactly canceled by mixing with small- x photons, and that this mixing can be treated perturbatively in QED, I simply put the divergent electron self-energy in $\mathcal{V}^\Lambda$, which is treated perturbatively.

These divergences place a severe constraint on our calculation. In perturbation theory they should cancel in gauge-invariant matrix elements, and *any non-perturbative approximation we choose must maintain this cancellation. In QED I will put all infrared singular operators in $\mathcal{V}^\Lambda$* , and the cancellations should proceed in bound state perturbation theory exactly as before if they are ‘super-renormalizable.’

Before deriving the electron-positron interaction, I should mention that the photon self-energy is not divergent, although it does contain a ‘mass’ term that is proportional to $\alpha \Lambda^2/P^+$. This bare mass is exactly canceled by mixing with electron-positron pairs and more complicated states at higher order, leaving a massless physical photon. If the cutoff is extremely large, the photon bare mass must be tuned very precisely to get accurate low energy results, which is one reason that we need to use a cutoff near the scale of physical interest in practical calculations. The photon mass should be placed in $\mathcal{V}^\Lambda$ and treated perturbatively for a ground state positronium calculation.

There are two time-ordered ‘diagrams’ involving photon exchange between an electron with initial momentum p_1 and final momentum p_2 , and a positron with initial momentum k_1 and final momentum k_2 . Using Eq. (96), we find the required matrix element of δH ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta H = & -\frac{e^2}{q^+} D_{\mu\nu}(q) \bar{u}(p_2, \sigma_2) \gamma^\mu u(p_1, \sigma_1) \bar{v}(k_1, \lambda_1) \gamma^\nu v(k_2, \lambda_2) \\
& \theta(|q^+| - \epsilon P^+) \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda_0^2}{P^+} - |p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-|\right) \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda_0^2}{P^+} - |k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-|\right) \\
& \left[\frac{\theta(|p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-| - \Lambda_1^2/P^+) \theta(|p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-| - |k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-|)}{p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{\theta(|k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-| - \Lambda_1^2/P^+) \theta(|k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-| - |p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-|)}{k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-} \right] \\
& \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda_1^2}{P^+} - |p_1^- + k_1^- - p_2^- - k_2^-|\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{153}$$

where $q^+ = p_1^+ - p_2^+$, $\mathbf{q}_\perp = \mathbf{p}_{1\perp} - \mathbf{p}_{2\perp}$, and $q^- = q_\perp^2/q^+$.

I have used the second cutoff on longitudinal momentum that I was forced to introduce when computing the change in the self-energy. We will see in the section on confinement that it is essential to include this cutoff everywhere consistently. In QED this point is not immediately important, because all infrared singular interactions, including the infrared divergent self-energy, are put in $\mathcal{V}^\Lambda$ and treated perturbatively. Since I do not compute perturbative corrections for positronium, I do not encounter the problem in QED.

To determine the interaction that must be added to the Hamiltonian to maintain coupling coherence, we must again find an interaction that added to δV reproduces itself with $\Lambda_0 \rightarrow \Lambda_1$ everywhere. The coupling coherent interaction generated by the first terms in δH are not uniquely determined at this order. There is some ambiguity because we can obtain coupling coherence either by having δH increase the strength of an operator by adding additional phase space strength, or we can have δH reduce the strength of an operator by subtracting phase space strength. The ambiguity is resolved in higher orders, so I will simply state the result. If an instantaneous photon-exchange interaction is present in H , we want δH to cancel part of this marginal operator and to increase the strength of a new photon-exchange interaction. This new interaction reproduces the effects of high energy photon exchange removed by the cutoff. The result is

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{coh}^\Lambda = & -\frac{e_\Lambda^2}{q^+} D_{\mu\nu}(q) \bar{u}(p_2, \sigma_2) \gamma^\mu u(p_1, \sigma_1) \bar{v}(k_1, \lambda_1) \gamma^\nu v(k_2, \lambda_2) \\
& \theta(|q^+| - \epsilon P^+) \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} - |p_1^- + k_1^- - p_2^- - k_2^-|\right) \\
& \left[\frac{\theta(|p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-| - \Lambda^2/P^+) \theta(|p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-| - |k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-|)}{p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-} \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{\theta(|k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-| - \Lambda^2/P^+) \theta(|k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-| - |p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-|)}{k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{154}$$

This matrix element exactly reproduces photon exchange above the cutoff. The cutoff removes the direct coupling of electron-positron states to electron-positron-photon states whose energy differs by more than the cutoff, and coupling coherence dictates that the result of this mixing should be replaced by a direct interaction between the electron and positron. We could obtain this result by much simpler means at this order by simply demanding that the Hamiltonian produce the ‘correct’ scattering amplitude at $\mathcal{O}(e^2)$ with the cutoffs in place. Of course, this procedure requires us to provide the ‘correct’ amplitude, but this is easily done in perturbation theory.

This interaction is rather unusual, because it arises from a tree diagram. In a Euclidean or equal-time renormalization group calculation, tree diagrams are usually

ignored. To understand this note that the renormalization group is generating interactions between low energy states produced by their mixing with high energy states, which means one needs to study transitions from low energy to high energy and back to low energy at second order. In equal-time coordinates the intermediate state will have high energy only if the photon has a large momentum; but in this case either the incoming or outgoing electron-positron pair will have a large relative momentum and cannot be a low energy state. In light-front coordinates the intermediate state can have high energy because the photon has a small longitudinal momentum. The exchange of a small longitudinal momentum photon has negligible effect on the relative longitudinal momentum of the pair, so a counterterm is produced. This counterterm is effectively local because of the cutoffs[18].

V_{coh}^Λ is non-canonical, and we will see that it is responsible for producing the Coulomb interaction. This same operator is produced by directly eliminating the electron-positron-photon sector[49]. However, such a direct elimination leads to the bound state energy appearing in the energy denominator, producing infrared divergences that depend on the interactions. Using a similarity transformation and coupling coherence we can produce the required energy-independent interaction without eliminating any Fock space sectors.

Almost all of this interaction is irrelevant (in the renormalization group sense), and the marginal part serves to exactly cancel the canonical instantaneous photon exchange interaction above the cutoff. Irrelevant operators typically have a small effect on the renormalization group trajectory of Hamiltonians for large cutoffs; however, as the cutoff approaches the bound state scale their effects become increasingly important. We need some guidance to decide which irrelevant operators are most important, and in light-front field theory we can use longitudinal momentum dependence, since it is only the transverse momentum dependence that affects whether an operator is relevant, marginal or irrelevant.

I assume that it is the most infrared singular part of V_{coh} that is important. As explained above, this operator receives substantial strength only from the exchange of photons with small longitudinal momentum; so we expect inverse q^+ dependence to indicate ‘strong’ interactions between low-energy pairs. So the part of V_{coh} that is included in $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_{coh}^\Lambda = & -e_\Lambda^2 \frac{q_\perp^2}{(q^+)^3} \bar{u}(p_2, \sigma_2) \gamma^+ u(p_1, \sigma_1) \bar{v}(k_1, \lambda_1) \gamma^+ v(k_2, \lambda_2) \\ & \theta(|q^+| - \epsilon P^+) \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} - |p_1^- + k_1^- - p_2^- - k_2^-|\right) \\ & \left[\frac{\theta(|p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-| - \Lambda^2/\mathcal{P}^+) \theta(|p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-| - |k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-|)}{p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\theta(|k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-| - \Lambda^2/\mathcal{P}^+) \theta(|k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-| - |p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-|)}{k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
= & -4e_\Lambda^2 \sqrt{p_1^+ p_2^+ k_1^+ k_2^+} \frac{q_1^2}{(q^+)^3} \delta_{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} \delta_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \\
& \theta(|q^+| - \epsilon P^+) \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} - |p_1^- + k_1^- - p_2^- - k_2^-|\right) \\
& \left[\frac{\theta(|p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-| - \Lambda^2/\mathcal{P}^+) \theta(|p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-| - |k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-|)}{p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-} \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{\theta(|k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-| - \Lambda^2/\mathcal{P}^+) \theta(|k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-| - |p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-|)}{k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-} \right]. \tag{155}
\end{aligned}$$

The Hamiltonian is almost complete to second order in the electron-positron sector, and only the instantaneous photon exchange interaction must be added. The matrix element of this interaction is

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{instant} &= -e_\Lambda^2 \left(\frac{1}{q^+}\right)^2 \bar{u}(p_2, \sigma_2) \gamma^+ u(p_1, \sigma_1) \bar{v}(k_1, \lambda_1) \gamma^+ v(k_2, \lambda_2) \\
&\quad \times \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} - |p_1^- + k_1^- - p_2^- - k_2^-|\right) \\
&= -4e_\Lambda^2 \sqrt{p_1^+ p_2^+ k_1^+ k_2^+} \left(\frac{1}{q^+}\right)^2 \delta_{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} \delta_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \\
&\quad \times \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} - |p_1^- + k_1^- - p_2^- - k_2^-|\right). \tag{156}
\end{aligned}$$

The only cutoff that appears is the cutoff directly run by the similarity transformation that prevents the initial and final states from differing in energy by more than Λ^2/P^+ .

This brings us to a final subtle point. Since there are no cutoffs in $V_{instant}$ that directly limit the momentum exchange, the matrix element diverges as $q^+ \rightarrow 0$. Consider $\tilde{V}_{coh}$ in this same limit,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{V}_{coh}^\Lambda &\rightarrow 4e_\Lambda^2 \sqrt{p_1^+ p_2^+ k_1^+ k_2^+} \left(\frac{1}{q^+}\right)^2 \delta_{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} \delta_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \\
&\quad \times \theta\left(|q^-| - \frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+}\right) \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} - |p_1^- + k_1^- - p_2^- - k_2^-|\right). \tag{157}
\end{aligned}$$

This means that as $q^+ \rightarrow 0$, V_{coh} partially screens $V_{instant}$, leaving the original operator multiplied by $\theta(\Lambda^2/P^+ - |q^-|)$. However, even after this partial screening, the matrix elements of the remaining part of $V_{instant}$ between bound states diverge and we must introduce the same infrared cutoff used for the self-energy to regulate these divergences. This is explicitly shown in the section on confinement. However, all

divergences from $V_{instant}$ are exactly canceled by the exchange of massless photons, which persists to arbitrarily small cutoff. This cancellation is exactly analogous to the cancellation of the infrared divergence of the self-energy, and will be treated in the same way. The portion of $V_{instant}$ that is not canceled by $\tilde{V}_{coh}$ will be included in $\mathcal{V}^\Lambda$, the perturbative part of the Hamiltonian. We will not encounter this interaction until we also include photon exchange below the cutoff perturbatively, so all infrared divergences should cancel in this bound state perturbation theory. I repeat that this is not guaranteed for arbitrary choices of $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$, and we are not free to simply cancel these divergent interactions with counterterms because coupling coherence completely determines the Hamiltonian.

I should also mention that if we do not include the canonical instantaneous photon exchange interaction in the seed Hamiltonian, coupling coherence will generate it.

We now have the complete interaction that I include in $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$. Letting $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda = h_0 + v_0^\Lambda$, where h_0 is the free hamiltonian, I add parts of $V_{instant}$ and V_{coh} to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
v_0^\Lambda = & -4e_\Lambda^2 \sqrt{p_1^+ p_2^+ k_1^+ k_2^+} \delta_{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} \delta_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} - |p_1^- + k_1^- - p_2^- - k_2^-|\right) \times \\
& \left\{ \left[\frac{q_\perp^2}{(q^+)^3} \frac{1}{p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-} + \frac{1}{(q^+)^2} \right] \theta(|p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-| - \Lambda^2/P^+) \right. \\
& \quad \times \theta(|p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-| - |k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-|) \\
& + \left[\frac{q_\perp^2}{(q^+)^3} \frac{1}{k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-} + \frac{1}{(q^+)^2} \right] \theta(|k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-| - \Lambda^2/P^+) \\
& \quad \left. \times \theta(|k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-| - |p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-|) \right\}. \quad (158)
\end{aligned}$$

There is remaining freedom in the cutoff dependence of $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ that should be used to obtain an efficient analysis of QED bound states, but I will not exploit this freedom here. Since we can always add and subtract any operator we please, we can use this freedom to decrease cutoff dependence. For example, there are several sharp cutoffs in v_0^Λ that result from my simple choice for the similarity transformation. We can add and subtract the same operator with a smoother cutoff to improve the analysis.

In order to present an analytic analysis I will make assumptions that are not necessary in a numerical analysis and that can be justified *a posteriori*. First I will assume that the electron and positron momenta can be arbitrarily large, but that in low-lying states their relative momenta satisfy

$$|\mathbf{p}_\perp - \mathbf{k}_\perp| \ll m, \quad (159)$$

$$|p^+ - k^+| \ll p^+ + k^+. \quad (160)$$

It is essential that the condition for longitudinal momenta not involve the electron mass, because masses have the scaling dimensions of transverse momenta and not

longitudinal momenta. As above, I use p for the electron momenta and k for the positron momenta. To be even more specific, I will assume that

$$|\mathbf{p}_\perp - \mathbf{k}_\perp| \sim \alpha m , \quad (161)$$

$$|p^+ - k^+| \sim \alpha(p^+ + k^+) . \quad (162)$$

This allows us to use power counting to evaluate the perturbative strength of operators for small coupling, which may prove essential in the analysis of QCD[14]. Note that these conditions allow us to infer

$$|\mathbf{p}_{1\perp} - \mathbf{p}_{2\perp}| \sim \alpha m , \quad (163)$$

$$|p_1^+ - p_2^+| \sim \alpha(p^+ + k^+) . \quad (164)$$

Given these order of magnitude estimates for momenta, we can drastically simplify the free energies in the kinetic energy operator and the energy denominators in v_0^Λ . We can use transverse boost invariance to choose a frame in which

$$p_i^+ = y_i P^+ , \quad p_{i\perp} = \kappa_i , \quad k_i^+ = (1 - y_i) P^+ , \quad k_{i\perp} = -\kappa_i , \quad (165)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} P^+(p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-) &= \frac{\kappa_1^2 + m^2}{y_1} - \frac{\kappa_2^2 + m^2}{y_2} - \frac{(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2}{y_1 - y_2} \\ &= -4m^2(y_1 - y_2) - \frac{(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2}{y_1 - y_2} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2 m^2) . \end{aligned} \quad (166)$$

To leading order all energy denominators are the same. Each energy denominator is $\mathcal{O}(\alpha m^2)$, which is large in comparison to the binding energy we will find. This is important, because the bulk of the photon exchange that is important for the low energy bound state involves intermediate states that have larger energy than the differences in constituent energies in the region of phase space where the wave function receives most of its strength. This allows us to use a perturbative renormalization group to compute the dominant effective interactions.

There are similar simplifications for all energy denominators. After making these approximations we find that the matrix element of v_0^Λ is

$$\begin{aligned} v_0^\Lambda &= 4e_\Lambda^2 \sqrt{y_1 y_2 (1 - y_1)(1 - y_2)} \theta\left(4m^2|y_1 - y_2| + \frac{(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2}{|y_1 - y_2|} - \Lambda^2\right) \\ &\quad \theta\left(\Lambda^2 - 4 \mid \kappa_1^2 + 4m^2(1 - 2y_1)^2 - \kappa_2^2 - 4m^2(1 - 2y_2)^2 \mid\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2}{(y_1 - y_2)^2} \left[\frac{1}{4m^2(y_1 - y_2)^2 + (\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2} - \frac{1}{(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2} \right] \\
= & -16e_\Lambda^2 m^2 \sqrt{y_1 y_2 (1 - y_1)(1 - y_2)} \theta \left(4m^2 |y_1 - y_2| + \frac{(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2}{|y_1 - y_2|} - \Lambda^2 \right) \\
& \theta \left(\Lambda^2 - 4 \mid \kappa_1^2 + 4m^2(1 - 2y_1)^2 - \kappa_2^2 - 4m^2(1 - 2y_2)^2 \mid \right) \\
& \left[\frac{1}{4m^2(y_1 - y_2)^2 + (\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2} \right]. \tag{167}
\end{aligned}$$

In principle the electron-positron annihilation graphs should also be included at this order, but the resultant effective interactions do not diverge as $q^+ \rightarrow 0$, so I include such effects perturbatively in $\mathcal{V}^\Lambda$.

At this point we can complete the zeroth order analysis of positronium using the state,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Psi(P)\rangle = & \sum_{\sigma\lambda} \int \frac{dp^+ d^2 p_\perp}{16\pi^3 p^+} \frac{dk^+ d^2 k_\perp}{16\pi^3 k^+} \sqrt{p^+ k^+} 16\pi^3 \delta^3(P - p - k) \\
& \phi(p, \sigma; k, \lambda) b^\dagger(p, \sigma) d^\dagger(k, \lambda) |0\rangle, \tag{168}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\phi(p, \sigma; k, \lambda)$ is the wave function for the relative motion of the electron and positron, with the center-of-mass momentum being P . We need to choose the longitudinal momentum appearing in the cutoff, and I will use the natural scale P^+ . The matrix element of $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \Psi(P) | \mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda | \Psi(P') \rangle = & 16\pi^3 \delta^3(P - P') \times \\
& \left\{ \int \frac{dy d^2 \kappa}{16\pi^3} \left[4m^2 + 4\kappa^2 + 4m^2(1 - 2y)^2 \right] |\phi(\kappa, y)|^2 \right. \\
& - 16e^2 m^2 \int \frac{dy_1 d^2 \kappa_1}{16\pi^3} \frac{dy_2 d^2 \kappa_2}{16\pi^3} \theta \left(4m^2 |y_1 - y_2| + \frac{(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2}{|y_1 - y_2|} - \Lambda^2 \right) \\
& \theta \left(\Lambda^2 - 4 \mid \kappa_1^2 + 4m^2(1 - 2y_1)^2 - \kappa_2^2 - 4m^2(1 - 2y_2)^2 \mid \right) \\
& \left. \left[\frac{1}{4m^2 |y_1 - y_2|^2 + (\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2} \right] \phi^*(\kappa_2, y_2) \phi(\kappa_1, y_1) \right\}. \tag{169}
\end{aligned}$$

I have chosen a frame in which $P_\perp = 0$ and used the Jacobi coordinates defined above, and indicated only the electron momentum in the wave function since momentum conservation fixes the positron momentum. I have also dropped the spin indices because the interaction in $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ is independent of spin.

If we vary this expectation value subject to the constraint that the wave function is normalized we obtain the equation of motion,

$$\begin{aligned}
M^2 \phi(\kappa_1, y_1) &= (4m^2 - 4mE + E^2) \phi(\kappa_1, y_1) \\
&= \left[4m^2 + 4\kappa_1^2 + 4m^2(1 - 2y_1)^2 \right] \phi(\kappa_1, y_1) \\
&\quad - 16e^2 m^2 \int \frac{dy_2 d^2 \kappa_2}{16\pi^3} \theta \left(4m^2 |y_1 - y_2| + \frac{(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2}{|y_1 - y_2|} - \Lambda^2 \right) \\
&\quad \theta \left(\Lambda^2 - 4 \mid \kappa_1^2 + 4m^2(1 - 2y_1)^2 - \kappa_2^2 - 4m^2(1 - 2y_2)^2 \mid \right) \\
&\quad \left[\frac{1}{4m^2 |y_1 - y_2|^2 + (\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2} \right] \phi(\kappa_2, y_2) . \tag{170}
\end{aligned}$$

E is the binding energy, and we can drop the E^2 term since it will be $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^4)$.

I do not think that it is possible to solve this equation analytically with the cutoffs in place, and with the light-front kinematic constraints $-1 \leq 1 - 2y_i \leq 1$. In order to determine the binding energy to leading order, we need to evaluate the regions of phase space removed by the cutoffs.

If we want to find a cutoff for which the ground state is dominated by the electron-positron component of the wave function, we need the first cutoff to remove the important part of the electron-positron-photon phase space. Using the ‘guess’ that $|\kappa| = \mathcal{O}(\alpha m)$ and $1 - 2y = \mathcal{O}(\alpha)$, this requires

$$\Lambda^2 < \alpha m^2 . \tag{171}$$

On the other hand, we cannot allow the cutoff to remove the region of the electron-positron phase space from which the wave function receives most of its strength. This requires

$$\Lambda^2 > \alpha^2 m^2 . \tag{172}$$

A compromise that satisfies both requirements is

$$\Lambda^2 = \alpha^{3/2} m^2 . \tag{173}$$

We are able to satisfy both requirements in QED because α is small. In QCD these competing constraints may require us to relax our assumption that ground state hadrons are well-approximated by the minimal valence configuration alone. This is an extremely important point that cannot be reasonably analyzed in QCD with simple power counting arguments. This problem will be illuminated by better approximations in QED that allow further Fock space sectors to enter the state non-perturbatively, and that thereby yield accurate results over a wider range of cutoffs. Another possibility is to use our freedom to add and subtract operators to the Hamiltonian. We can avoid using interactions in $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ that are pinched between two cutoffs by adding and subtracting operators that do not have the lower cutoff, for example.

If we choose $\Lambda = \alpha^{3/4}m$, we can remove both cutoffs and allow $-\infty < 1 - 2y_i < \infty$ as a first approximation for the integral equation, without altering the leading power law behavior of the binding energy. These approximations will produce $\mathcal{O}(e^5)$ errors in the leading analysis, but these errors become important when we go to the next order and must be fixed. There are a number of ways to do this in QED.

With these final approximations the analytic solution is

$$\phi(\kappa, y) = \sqrt{8\pi\alpha^5 m^6} \left(\kappa^2 + (1 - 2y)^2 m^2 + mE \right)^{-2}, \quad (174)$$

$$E = \frac{1}{4}\alpha^2 m. \quad (175)$$

This is exactly the Bohr energy, and the wave function is related to the Fourier transform of the nonrelativistic positronium ground state wave function. Note that this wave function is normalized only to leading order.

I hope to have accomplished two objectives in this section. First, I wanted to use a familiar bound state problem to illustrate the formalism. At first, the arguments seem extremely complicated; but this is largely because I started with the full field theory and systematically derived a leading approximation for the ground state. The reader should try doing this in equal-time field theory, especially in a gauge other than Coulomb gauge. My second objective was to lay the groundwork for the discussion of confinement in QCD. To $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ the coupling coherent QCD Hamiltonian is almost identical to the QED Hamiltonian, and the only difference in my analysis of QCD is my choice of $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$, which is based on physics.

12 Asymptotic Freedom

Before I proceed to the discussion of confinement, I must discuss asymptotic freedom in Hamiltonian light-front QCD briefly. In order to derive a constituent picture, we must replace almost all Fock space components that appear in hadronic wave functions when the cutoff is arbitrarily large with effective operators in the Hamiltonian and other observables. It has long been understood that degrees of freedom that couple perturbatively can be removed from the wave functions and replaced by effective interactions, and we will certainly want to remove as many degrees of freedom as possible in this manner. Since QCD is asymptotically free[53], we might hope to remove an infinite number of scales perturbatively, as is done in lattice gauge theory.

The first problem we must face before exploiting asymptotic freedom is that asymptotic freedom is known from Lagrangian calculations in which covariance and gauge invariance are maintained manifestly. Moreover, the coupling runs with the four-momentum squared, and this is not a variable that we encounter directly in light-front Hamiltonian calculations. To exploit asymptotic freedom we need the coupling to run with the cutoff that is run by the perturbative light-front renormalization group, and we need to find that the coupling becomes arbitrarily small as this

cutoff is taken to infinity. If this happens, we can hope to exploit coupling coherence in the regime of asymptotic freedom to approximate the light-front Hamiltonian. Of course, we need to reduce the cutoff as far as possible so that hadronic states can be dominated by low-energy few-parton components, and we will be limited by the fact that the coupling grows as the cutoff is reduced.

The results I show in this section do not come from a third-order similarity transformation, because the appropriate calculation has not been completed yet. I will show the results of a third-order, time-ordered calculation of the quark-gluon vertex[11]. If the same cutoffs are used, the similarity results should be identical.

As discussed in the last section, renormalization is complicated in light-cone gauge by infrared singularities that are commonly thought to be spurious. In Lagrangian QCD these result from inverse powers of longitudinal momenta in the gluon propagator. Light-front infrared singularities are typically avoided in Lagrangian QCD by using a pole prescription developed by Mandelstam[54] and Leibbrandt[55]. Bassetto, Nardelli and Soldati[5] have provided a broad discussion of renormalization in light-cone gauge, and I refer the interested reader to their excellent work. What is most important for my discussion is that the Mandelstam-Leibbrandt pole prescription prevents us from directly relating light-front time-ordered diagrams to Feynman diagrams, because the poles are inappropriately placed to complete k^- integrals first.

Simple arguments from second-order perturbation theory[56] indicate that the so-called spurious infrared divergences play an important role in understanding asymptotic freedom in Hamiltonian light-front QCD, so we should not expect any reasonable regulator to remove them.

The first one-loop calculations relevant to asymptotic freedom in light-cone gauge were completed by Thorn (see Thorn in [9]), who showed that the four-gluon vertex displays asymptotic freedom to leading order. The first calculations for the quark-gluon vertex in Lagrangian QCD were completed by Curci, Furmanski, and Petronzio[57].

In order to study contributions from various regions of phase space, I will cut off transverse and longitudinal momenta separately, so that

$$k^+ > \epsilon, \quad |\mathbf{k}_\perp| < \Lambda. \quad (176)$$

In addition to these cutoffs, I regularize the familiar infrared divergences that occur in gauge theories for small $|\mathbf{k}_\perp|$ by requiring all loop momenta to satisfy $|\mathbf{k}_\perp| > \mu$. In a renormalization group transformation this type of infrared problem is usually avoided, because there are always lower and upper cutoffs. I assume that μ is much larger than all other masses in the problem, and consider only the leading contribution to the running coupling constant from degrees of freedom with large transverse momenta.

We must compute a complete set of one-loop corrections to the off-shell quark-gluon vertex function, $\Gamma(E; p_1, p_2; q)$, with E being the off-shell energy. These corrections are divided into five parts, so that $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 + \cdots + \Gamma_5$. Γ_1 includes all diagrams in which there is a gluon loop attached to the quark line, and the emitted gluon

attaches to the quark outside the loop. ‘Mass’ subtractions are made to isolate the vertex renormalization. Γ_2 consists of diagrams in which the outgoing gluon attaches to the quark inside the loop, and Γ_3 includes the diagrams in which the outgoing gluon attaches to the gluon in the loop. Γ_4 includes diagrams in which the outgoing gluon is dressed by a fermion loop, plus the appropriate ‘mass’ counterterms. Finally, Γ_5 includes diagrams in which the outgoing gluon is dressed by a gluon loop, plus the appropriate ‘mass’ counterterms. The number of diagrams required is much larger than needed in a manifestly covariant, gauge invariant Lagrangian calculation.

For massless quarks, the ultraviolet divergent parts of the vertex corrections are

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_1(p_1, p_2; q) = \frac{g^3}{8\pi^2} \bar{u}(p_2) \not{q} u(p_1) T^a (-C_F) \left\{ 2 \ln\left(\frac{p_1^+ p_2^+}{\epsilon^2}\right) - 3 \right\} \ln\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}\right), \quad (177)$$

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_2(p_1, p_2; q) = \frac{g^3}{8\pi^2} \bar{u}(p_2) \not{q} u(p_1) T^a (C_F - \frac{C_A}{2}) \left\{ 2 \ln\left(\frac{p_1^+ p_2^+}{\epsilon^2}\right) - 3 \right\} \ln\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}\right), \quad (178)$$

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_3(p_1, p_2; q) = \frac{g^3}{8\pi^2} \bar{u}(p_2) \not{q} u(p_1) T^a \left(\frac{C_A}{2}\right) \left\{ 2 \ln\left(\frac{p_1^+ p_2^+}{\epsilon^2}\right) - 3 + 4 \ln\left(\frac{q^+}{\epsilon}\right) \right\} \ln\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}\right), \quad (179)$$

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_4(p_1, p_2; q) = \frac{g^3}{8\pi^2} \bar{u}(p_2) \not{q} u(p_1) T^a \left(\frac{-N_f}{3}\right) \ln\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}\right), \quad (180)$$

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_5(p_1, p_2; q) = \frac{g^3}{8\pi^2} \bar{u}(p_2) \not{q} u(p_1) T^a (C_A/2) \left\{ \frac{11}{3} - 4 \ln\left(\frac{q^+}{\epsilon}\right) \right\} \ln\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}\right). \quad (181)$$

For SU(3), $C_F = 4/3$ and $C_A = 3$; while N_f is the number of light quark flavors. The sum of these individual contributions to the ultraviolet divergent part of the vertex is

$$\tilde{\Gamma}(p_1, p_2; q) = \frac{g^3}{16\pi^2} \bar{u}(p_2) \not{q} u(p_1) T^a \left\{ \frac{11C_A}{3} - \frac{2N_f}{3} \right\} \ln\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}\right). \quad (182)$$

All light-front infrared divergences cancel. Note however, there are infrared divergent terms of $\mathcal{O}(\mu \ln(\epsilon)/\Lambda)$ that do not diverge as $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ with ϵ fixed (*i.e.*, ultraviolet irrelevant). These are not shown, they do not cancel, and they are energy-dependent. If a vertex cutoff that limits light-front energy transfer is used, Λ and ϵ are related. As a result of this relationship, $\ln(\epsilon)/\Lambda$ is a small number when Λ is large, and there is no ambiguity regarding the dominant contributions to vertex renormalization at the one-loop level. This is a clear illustration of why we must choose light-front energy cutoffs to obtain a well-behaved perturbative expansion for

the QCD Hamiltonian. The serious light-front infrared divergences that forced me to introduce a second cutoff for the electron self-energy *do not* appear in the vertex correction. Eq. (182) is exactly what is obtained in Lagrangian QCD[53].

A Ward identity we might naively expect to find, $\tilde{\Gamma}_1 + \tilde{\Gamma}_2 + \tilde{\Gamma}_3 = 0$, does not hold. There are infrared divergences that violate this relationship, and it is not just renormalization of the gluon propagator that leads to asymptotic freedom. In fact, $\tilde{\Gamma}_5$ contains the logarithmic divergence normally associated with asymptotic freedom, but it also contains stronger divergences that have the wrong sign for asymptotic freedom, as first noted by Thorn. These extra divergences are not an artifact of the cutoffs that can be removed. They are an inevitable consequence of using a Hamiltonian formulation and a gauge in which no ghosts occur. This is easily understood by considering second-order perturbation theory[56]. It is not possible for gluon wavefunction renormalization to lead to asymptotic freedom in a Hamiltonian formulation with a positive metric Fock space. Vacuum polarization can only screen the bare charge. Any regulator that alters this result will also force us to introduce ghosts, with disastrous effects for non-perturbative Fock space calculations.

While infrared divergences cancel in the ultraviolet divergent corrections associated with asymptotic freedom, they are a sign of singular long-range interactions that should significantly modify perturbation theory at some point. There is no reason to expect that gluons will continue to screen the singular interactions in the QCD Hamiltonian as the cutoff is lowered. While it is reasonable to assume that cancellations are maintained in QED by massless photons, such massless excitations must be removed from the spectrum in QCD non-perturbatively. At this time it is not clear whether the infrared divergences are disasters or welcome precursors of non-perturbative physics that may appear in relatively simple operators. I take the latter view in the next section.

13 A New Confinement Mechanism

This section relies heavily on the discussion of positronium, because I only require the QCD Hamiltonian determined to $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ to discuss a simple confinement mechanism which appears naturally in light-front QCD. To this order the QCD Hamiltonian in the quark-antiquark sector is almost identical to the QED Hamiltonian in the electron-positron sector. Of course the QCD Hamiltonian differs significantly from the QED Hamiltonian in other sectors, and this is essential for justifying my choice of $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ for non-perturbative calculations.

The basic strategy for doing a sequence of (hopefully) increasingly accurate QCD bound state calculations is identical to the strategy for doing QED calculations up to the point I will reach in this paper. I use coupling coherence to find an expansion for H^Λ in powers of the QCD coupling constant to a finite order. I then divide the Hamiltonian into a non-perturbative part, $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$, and a perturbative part, $\mathcal{V}^\Lambda$. The division is based on the physical argument that adding a parton in an intermediate

state should require more energy than indicated by the free Hamiltonian, and that as a result these states will ‘freeze out’ as the cutoff approaches Λ_{QCD} . When this happens the evolution of the Hamiltonian as the cutoff is lowered further changes qualitatively, and operators that were consistently canceled over an infinite number of scales also freeze, so that their effects in the few parton sectors can be studied directly. A one-body operator and a two-body operator arise in this fashion, and serve to confine both quarks and gluons.

The simple confinement mechanism I outline is certainly not the final story, but it may be the seed for the full confinement mechanism. One of the most serious problems we face when looking for non-perturbative effects such as confinement is that the search itself depends on the effect. A candidate mechanism must be found and then shown to self-consistently produce itself as the cutoff is lowered towards Λ_{QCD} .

Once we find a candidate confinement mechanism, it is possible to study heavy quark bound states with little modification of the QED strategy. Of course the results in QCD will differ from those in QED because of the new choice of $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$, and in higher orders because of the gluon interactions. When we move on to light quark bound states, it becomes essential to introduce a mechanism for chiral symmetry breaking[13, 14]. Chiral symmetry breaking cannot show up in a perturbative coupling coherence analysis unless the cutoffs violate chiral symmetry. The best we can hope for is that the pion mass-squared will turn out to be negative, because this is a clear signal that symmetry breaking will occur[58]. In this case, the chiral symmetry breaking operators, whose origin is vacuum structure in equal-time calculations, will serve to raise the pion mass to zero. I will discuss this briefly in the last section.

When we compute the QCD Hamiltonian to $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$, several significant new features appear. First are the familiar gluon interactions. In addition to the many gluon interactions found in the canonical Hamiltonian, there are modifications to the instantaneous gluon exchange interactions, just as there were modifications to the electron-positron interaction. For example, a Coulomb interaction will automatically arise. In addition the gluon self-energy will differ drastically from the photon self-energy.

Recall that the photon develops a self-energy because it mixes with electron-positron pairs, and this self energy is $\mathcal{O}(\alpha\Lambda^2/P^+)$. For small cutoffs this small bare self-energy is exactly canceled when the photon is allowed to mix with pairs below the cutoff. I will not go through the calculation, but because the gluon also mixes with gluon pairs in QCD, the gluon self-energy acquires an infrared divergence, just as the electron did in QED. In QCD both the quark and gluon self-energies are proportional to $\alpha\Lambda^2 \ln(1/\epsilon)/P^+$, where ϵ is the secondary cutoff on parton longitudinal momenta introduced in section 11. This means that even when the primary cutoff Λ^2 is finite, the energy of a single quark or a single gluon is infinite, because we are supposed to let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. One can easily argue that this result is meaningless, because the relevant matrix elements of the Hamiltonian are not even gauge invariant; however, since we

must live with a variational principle when doing Hamiltonian calculations, this result may be useful.

In QED I argued that the bare electron self-energy was a complete lie, because the bare electron mixes with photons carrying arbitrarily small longitudinal momenta to cancel this bare self-energy and produce a finite mass physical electron. However, in QCD there is no reason to believe that this perturbative mixing continues to arbitrarily small cutoffs. *There are no massless gluons in the world.* In this case, *the free QCD Hamiltonian is a complete lie and cannot be trusted at small energies.*

On the other hand, coupling coherence gives us no choice about the quark and gluon self-energies as computed in perturbation theory. These self-energies appear because of the behavior of the theory at extremely high energies. The question is not whether large self-energies appear in the Hamiltonian. The question is whether these self-energies are canceled by mixing with low-energy multi-gluon states. I argue that this cancellation does not occur, and that *the infrared divergent quark and gluon self-energies should be included in $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$.* The transverse scale for these energies is the running scale Λ , and over many orders of magnitude we should see the self-energies canceled by mixing. However, as the cutoff approaches Λ_{QCD} , I speculate that these cancellations cease to occur because bound states involving gluons arise and produce a mass gap.

But if the quark and gluon self-energies diverge, and the divergences cannot be canceled by mixing between sectors with an increasingly large number of partons, how is it possible to obtain finite mass hadrons? The parton-parton interaction also diverges, and one of my main objectives in this section is to show that the infrared divergence in the two-body interaction exactly cancels the infrared divergence in the one-body operator for color singlet states.

Of course, the cancellation of infrared divergences is not enough to obtain confinement. The cancellation is exact regardless of the relative motion of the partons in a color singlet state, and confinement requires a residual interaction. I will show that the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ QCD Hamiltonian produces a logarithmic potential in both longitudinal and transverse directions. I will not discuss whether a logarithmic confining potential is reasonable, but to the best of my knowledge there is no rigorous demonstration that the confining interaction should be linear, and a logarithmic potential may certainly be of interest phenomenologically for heavy quark bound states[59, 60].

The calculation of how the quark self-energy changes when a similarity transformation lowers the cutoff on energy transfer is almost identical to the electron self-energy calculation. Following the steps in the section on positronium, we find the one-body operator required by coupling coherence,

$$\Sigma_{coh}^\Lambda(p) = \frac{g^2 C_F}{8\pi^2 p^+} \left\{ 2y\Lambda^2 \ln \left(\frac{y^2 \Lambda^2}{(y\Lambda^2 + m^2)\epsilon} \right) - \frac{3}{2} y\Lambda^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{ym^2 \Lambda^2}{y\Lambda^2 + m^2} \right\}$$

$$+ 3m^2 \ln\left(\frac{m^2}{y\Lambda^2 + m^2}\right)\Big\} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon/y) . \quad (183)$$

The calculation of the quark-antiquark interaction required by coupling coherence is also nearly identical to the QED calculation. Keeping only the infrared singular parts of the interaction, as was done in a first calculation for QED,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_{coh}^\Lambda = & -4g_\Lambda^2 C_F \sqrt{p_1^+ p_2^+ k_1^+ k_2^+} \frac{q_1^2}{(q^+)^3} \delta_{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} \delta_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \\ & \theta(|q^+| - \epsilon P^+) \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} - |p_1^- + k_1^- - p_2^- - k_2^-|\right) \\ & \left[\frac{\theta(|p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-| - \Lambda^2/P^+) \theta(|p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-| - |k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-|)}{p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\theta(|k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-| - \Lambda^2/P^+) \theta(|k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-| - |p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-|)}{k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-} \right] . \end{aligned} \quad (184)$$

The instantaneous gluon exchange interaction is

$$\begin{aligned} V_{instant}^\Lambda = & -4g_\Lambda^2 C_F \sqrt{p_1^+ p_2^+ k_1^+ k_2^+} \left(\frac{1}{q^+}\right)^2 \delta_{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} \delta_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \\ & \times \theta(|q^+| - \epsilon P^+) \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} - |p_1^- + k_1^- - p_2^- - k_2^-|\right) . \end{aligned} \quad (185)$$

Just as in QED the coupling coherent interaction induced by gluon exchange above the cutoff partially cancels instantaneous gluon exchange. For the discussion of confinement the part of V_{coh} that remains is not important, because it produces a Coulomb interaction. However, the part of the instantaneous interaction that is not canceled is

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_{instant}^\Lambda = & -4g_\Lambda^2 C_F \sqrt{p_1^+ p_2^+ k_1^+ k_2^+} \left(\frac{1}{q^+}\right)^2 \delta_{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} \delta_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \\ & \times \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} - |p_1^- + k_1^- - p_2^- - k_2^-|\right) \theta(|p_1^+ - p_2^+| - \epsilon P^+) \\ & \times \left[\theta\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} - |p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-|\right) \theta(|p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-| - |k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-|) + \right. \\ & \left. \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} - |k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-|\right) \theta(|k_2^- - k_1^- - q^-| - |p_1^- - p_2^- - q^-|) \right] . \end{aligned} \quad (186)$$

Note that this interaction contains a cutoff that projects onto exchange energies below the cutoff, because the interaction has been screened by gluon exchange above the cutoffs. This interaction can become important at long distances, if parton exchange below the cutoff is dynamically suppressed. In QED I argued that this singular long range interaction is exactly canceled by photon exchange below the cutoff, because such exchange is not suppressed no matter how low the cutoff becomes. Photons are massless and experience no significant interactions, so they are exchanged to arbitrarily low energies as effectively free photons. This cannot be the case for gluons.

For the discussion of confinement, I will place only the most singular parts of the quark self-energy and the quark-antiquark interaction in $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$. To see that all infrared divergences cancel and that the residual long range interaction is logarithmic, we can study the matrix element of these operators for a quark-antiquark state,

$$|\Psi(P)\rangle = \sum_{\sigma\lambda} \sum_{rs} \int \frac{dp^+ d^2 p_\perp}{16\pi^3 p^+} \frac{dk^+ d^2 k_\perp}{16\pi^3 k^+} \sqrt{p^+ k^+} 16\pi^3 \delta^3(P - p - k) \phi(p, \sigma, r; k, \lambda, s) b^{r\dagger}(p, \sigma) d^{s\dagger}(k, \lambda) |0\rangle, \quad (187)$$

where r and s are color indices and I will choose ϕ to be a color singlet and drop color indices. The cancellations we find do not occur for the color octet configuration. The matrix element is,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi(P) | \mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda | \Psi(P') \rangle &= 16\pi^3 P^+ \delta^3(P - P') \times \\ &\left\{ \int \frac{dy d^2 \kappa}{16\pi^3} \left[\frac{g_\Lambda^2 C_F \Lambda^2}{2\pi^2 P^+} \ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) \right] |\phi(\kappa, y)|^2 \right. \\ &- \frac{4g_\Lambda^2 C_F}{P^+} \int \frac{dy_1 d^2 \kappa_1}{16\pi^3} \frac{dy_2 d^2 \kappa_2}{16\pi^3} \theta \left(\Lambda^2 - \left| \frac{\kappa_1^2 + m^2}{y_1(1-y_1)} - \frac{\kappa_2^2 + m^2}{y_2(1-y_2)} \right| \right) \\ &\times \left[\theta \left(\Lambda^2 - \left| \frac{\kappa_1^2 + m^2}{y_1} - \frac{\kappa_2^2 + m^2}{y_2} - \frac{(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2}{|y_1 - y_2|} \right| \right) \right. \\ &\times \theta \left(\left| \frac{\kappa_1^2 + m^2}{y_1} - \frac{\kappa_2^2 + m^2}{y_2} - \frac{(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2}{|y_1 - y_2|} \right| - \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left| \frac{\kappa_2^2 + m^2}{1-y_2} - \frac{\kappa_1^2 + m^2}{1-y_1} - \frac{(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2}{|y_1 - y_2|} \right| \right) \\ &+ \theta \left(\Lambda^2 - \left| \frac{\kappa_2^2 + m^2}{1-y_2} - \frac{\kappa_1^2 + m^2}{1-y_1} - \frac{(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2}{|y_1 - y_2|} \right| \right) \\ &\times \theta \left(\left| \frac{\kappa_2^2 + m^2}{1-y_2} - \frac{\kappa_1^2 + m^2}{1-y_1} - \frac{(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2}{|y_1 - y_2|} \right| - \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left| \frac{\kappa_1^2 + m^2}{y_1} - \frac{\kappa_2^2 + m^2}{y_2} - \frac{(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2}{|y_1 - y_2|} \right| \right) \left. \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\times \theta(|y_1 - y_2| - \epsilon) \left(\frac{1}{y_1 - y_2} \right)^2 \phi^*(\kappa_2, y_2) \phi(\kappa_1, y_1) \Big\}. \quad (188)$$

Here I have chosen a frame in which the center-of-mass transverse momentum is zero, assumed that the longitudinal momentum scale introduced by the cutoffs is that of the bound state, and used Jacobi coordinates,

$$p_i^+ = y_i P^+, \quad p_{i\perp} = \kappa_i; \quad k_i^+ = (1 - y_i) P^+, \quad k_{i\perp} = -\kappa_i. \quad (189)$$

The first thing I want to do is show that the last term is divergent and the divergence exactly cancels the first term. My demonstration is not elegant, but it is straightforward. The divergence results from the region $y_1 \sim y_2$. In this region the second and third cutoffs restrict $(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2$ to be small compared to Λ^2 , so we should change variables,

$$Q = \frac{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2}{2}, \quad Y = \frac{y_1 + y_2}{2}; \quad q = \kappa_1 - \kappa_2, \quad y = y_1 - y_2. \quad (190)$$

Using these variables we can approximate the above interaction near $q = 0$ and $y = 0$. The double integral becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{-4g_\Lambda^2 C_F}{P^+} \int \frac{dY d^2 Q}{16\pi^3} \frac{dy d^2 q}{16\pi^3} \theta(1 - Y) \theta(Y) |\phi(Q, Y)|^2 \\ & \theta\left(\Lambda^2 - \frac{q^2}{|y|}\right) \theta(|y| - \epsilon) \theta(\eta - |y|) \left(\frac{1}{y}\right)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (191)$$

where η is an arbitrary constant that restricts $|y|$ from becoming large. Completing the q and y integration we get

$$- \frac{g_\Lambda^2 C_F \Lambda^2}{2\pi^2 P^+} \ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) \int \frac{dY d^2 Q}{16\pi^3} \theta(1 - Y) \theta(Y) |\phi(Q, Y)|^2. \quad (192)$$

The divergent part of this exactly cancels the first term on the right-hand side of Eq. (188). This cancellation occurs for any state, and this cancellation is unusual because it is between the expectation value of a one-body operator and the expectation value of a two-body operator. The cancellation resembles what happens in the Schwinger model and is easily understood. It results from the fact that a color singlet has no color monopole moment. If the state is a color octet the divergences are both positive and cannot cancel. Since the cancellation occurs in the matrix element, we can let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ before diagonalizing $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$.

The fact that the divergences cancel exactly does not indicate that confinement occurs. This requires the residual interactions to diverge at large distances, which means small momentum transfer. Equivalently, we need the color dipole self-energy to diverge if the color dipole moment diverges because the partons separate to large distance.

My analysis of the residual interaction is neither elegant nor complete. I will only establish that the interaction is logarithmic in the longitudinal direction at zero transverse separation and logarithmic in the transverse direction at zero longitudinal separation. I will not compute the range of the interaction or consider separations in both longitudinal and transverse directions. The analysis is complicated by the step function cutoffs, by the presence of the infrared divergence analyzed above, and by the lack of simple variables that display a kinematic rotational invariance.

In order to avoid the infrared divergence, I will compute spatial derivatives of the potential. This removes the constant infrared divergence, but it also hides dependence on the range of the interaction; both of which are easily seen by considering derivatives of $c_1 + c_2 \ln(r/a)$.

Let us first consider the potential in the longitudinal direction. Given a momentum space expression, we can set $x_\perp = 0$ and the Fourier transform of the longitudinal interaction requires the transverse momentum integral of the potential,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z} V(z) = \int \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} i q_z V(q_\perp, q_z) e^{i q_z z} . \quad (193)$$

We are interested only in the long range potential, so we can assume that q_z is arbitrarily small during the analysis and approximate the step functions accordingly.

For our interaction this leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^-} V(x^-) &= -4g_\Lambda^2 C_F P^+ \int \frac{dq^+ d^2 q_\perp}{16\pi^3} \theta(P^+ - |q^+|) \\ &\quad \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} - \frac{q_\perp^2}{|q^+|}\right) \left(\frac{1}{q^+}\right)^2 (i q^+) e^{i q^+ x^-} . \end{aligned} \quad (194)$$

Completing the $q_\perp$ integration we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^-} V(x^-) &= -\frac{i g_\Lambda^2 C_F \Lambda^2}{4\pi^2} \int dq^+ \theta(P^+ - |q^+|) \frac{q^+}{|q^+|} e^{i q^+ x^-} \\ &= \frac{g_\Lambda^2 C_F \Lambda^2}{2\pi^2} \int_0^{P^+} dq^+ \sin(q^+ x^-) \\ &= \frac{g_\Lambda^2 C_F \Lambda^2}{2\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{x^-} - \frac{\cos(P^+ x^-)}{x^-} \right) \\ &= \frac{g_\Lambda^2 C_F \Lambda^2}{2\pi^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^-} \ln(|x^-|) + \text{short range} . \end{aligned} \quad (195)$$

To see that the term involving a cosine in the next-to-last line produces a short range potential, simply integrate it. At large $|x^-|$, which is the only place we can trust our approximations for the original integrand, this yields a logarithmic potential, as promised.

Next consider the potential in the transverse direction. Here we can set $x^- = 0$ and get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\perp}^i} V(x_{\perp}) &= -4g_{\Lambda}^2 C_F P^+ \int \frac{dq^+ d^2 q_{\perp}}{16\pi^3} \theta(P^+ - |q^+|) \\ &\quad \theta\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{P^+} - \frac{q_{\perp}^2}{|q^+|}\right) \left(\frac{1}{q^+}\right)^2 (iq_{\perp}^i) e^{i\mathbf{q}_{\perp} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{\perp}}. \end{aligned} \quad (196)$$

Here I have used the fact that the integration is dominated by small q^+ to simplify the integrand again. Completing the q^+ integration this becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\perp}^i} V(x_{\perp}) &= -\frac{ig_{\Lambda}^2 C_F \Lambda^2}{2\pi^3} \int d^2 q_{\perp} \frac{q_{\perp}^i}{q_{\perp}^2} e^{i\mathbf{q}_{\perp} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{\perp}} + \text{short range} \\ &= \frac{g_{\Lambda}^2 C_F \Lambda^2}{\pi^2} \frac{x_{\perp}^i}{x_{\perp}^2} \\ &= \frac{g_{\Lambda}^2 C_F \Lambda^2}{\pi^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\perp}^i} \ln(|\mathbf{x}_{\perp}|). \end{aligned} \quad (197)$$

Once again, this is the derivative of a logarithmic potential, as promised. The strength of the long-range logarithmic potential is not spherically symmetrical in these coordinates, with the potential being larger in the transverse than in the longitudinal direction. A simple numerical analysis indicates that the departure goes like $\cos^2(\theta)$.

This violation of simple nonrelativistic rotational invariance has interesting implications for the constituent wave function. It survives when the quark mass is taken into account. For massive quarks in the weak coupling limit, low-lying states are nonrelativistic Coulombic bound states, and the long-range potential is not important until the bound state radius approaches the distance at which the logarithmic potential is as strong as the Coulomb potential. Even for low-lying states, however, the presence of a *weak* long-range potential that violates rotational invariance affects the spectrum and the states. We can study how violations cancel perturbatively as a clue to how the symmetry might be dynamically restored for the low-lying states non-perturbatively. Perturbatively this depends on a cancellation between the instantaneous interaction and gluon exchange, and it becomes highly non-trivial to show that mixing with low-lying states containing an extra gluon can restore rotational invariance non-perturbatively. I believe it requires a calculation that allows string-like gluon configurations between heavy quarks when they are separated by a distance comparable to the size of the lowest-lying bound state containing an extra gluon.

Had we computed the quark-gluon or gluon-gluon interaction, we would find essentially the same residual long range two-body interaction in every Fock space sector. In QCD gluons have a divergent self-energy and experience divergent long range

interactions with other partons if we use coupling coherence. In this sense, the assumption that gluon exchange below some cutoff is suppressed is consistent with the Hamiltonian that results from this assumption. To show that gluon exchange is suppressed when $\Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda_{QCD}$, rather than some other scale (*i.e.*, zero as in QED), a non-perturbative calculation of gluon exchange is required. This is exactly the calculation bound state perturbation theory produces, and bound state perturbation theory suggests how the perturbative renormalization group calculation might be modified to generate these confining interactions self-consistently.

If perturbation theory, which produced this potential, continues to be reasonable, this long range potential will be exactly canceled in QCD just as it is in QED. We need this exact cancellation of new forces to occur at short distances and turn off at long distances, if we want asymptotic freedom to give way to a simple constituent confinement mechanism. At short distances the divergent self-energies and two-body interactions cannot be ignored, but they should exactly cancel pairwise if these divergences appear only when gluons are emitted and absorbed in immediately successive vertices, as I have speculated. The residual interaction must be analyzed more carefully at short distances, but in any case a logarithmic potential is less singular than a Coulomb interaction, which does not disturb asymptotic freedom. This is the easy part of the problem. The hard part is discovering how the potential can survive at any scale.

A perturbative renormalization group will not solve this problem. The key I have suggested is that interactions between quarks and gluons in the intermediate states required for cancellation of the potential will eventually produce a non-negligible energy gap. I am unable to detail this mechanism without an explicit calculation, but let me sketch a naive picture of how this might happen.

Focus on the quark-antiquark-gluon intermediate state, which mixes with the quark-antiquark state to screen the long range potential. The free energy of this intermediate state is always higher than that of the quark-antiquark free energy, as is shown using a simple kinematic argument[14]. However, if the gluon is massless, the energy gap between such states can be made arbitrarily small. As we use a similarity transformation to run a vertex cutoff on energy transfer, mixing persists to arbitrarily small cutoffs since the gap can be made arbitrarily small. Wilson has suggested using a gluon mass to produce a gap that will prevent this mixing from persisting as the cutoff approaches Λ_{QCD} [14], and I am suggesting a slightly different mechanism.

If we allow two-body interactions to act in both sectors to all orders, even the Coulomb interaction can produce quark-antiquark and quark-antiquark-gluon bound states. In this respect QCD again differs qualitatively from QED because the photon cannot be bound and the energy gap is always arbitrarily small even when the electron-positron interaction produces bound states. If we assume that a fixed energy gap arises between the quark-antiquark bound states and the quark-antiquark-gluon bound states, and that this gap establishes the important scale for non-perturbative QCD, these states must cease to mix as the cutoff goes below the gap.

Of course, this qualitative change in the evolution of the Hamiltonian will not occur all at once. Long before a bound state energy gap is encountered directly, the continuum density of states will be shifted from the free density and alter the mixing. Note that small shifts will be unable to alter the cancellation of infrared divergences, because these effects are more singular than all others.

If we want to include the effect of confining interactions at any scale, it is not possible to use momentum eigenstates, because their energy diverges. Since asymptotic freedom is most easily seen in momentum space (which diagonalizes the fixed point Hamiltonian), any new basis used to include confinement should closely resemble momentum eigenstates at short distances and high energies. This suggests a wave packet (or wavelet) analysis, as long advocated by Wilson[14].

An important ingredient for any calculation that tries to establish confinement self-consistently is a *seed mechanism*, because it is possible that it is the confining interaction itself which alters the evolution of the Hamiltonian so that confinement can arise. I have proposed a simple seed mechanism whose perturbative origin is appealing because this allows the non-perturbative evolution induced by confinement to be matched on to the perturbative evolution required by asymptotic freedom.

14 Future Prospects

Instead of summarizing what I have said, I want to use this final section to discuss the large number of problems left unsolved.

The strategy I have outlined will no doubt evolve as new results reveal its flaws. While it is possible that a constituent picture will eventually emerge from QCD, it seems unlikely that it will take the simple form envisioned in this paper. The quarks and gluons I have employed are still very close to the bare quarks and gluons one sees when studying QCD at very large cutoffs, near the free field fixed point. I have painted a picture in which the Hamiltonian evolves perturbatively over an infinite number of scales, with each scale providing a rather simple layer of structure for the partons and slightly altering the vertices and direct interactions, slowly building up new interactions required by the hidden symmetries of the theory.

I have assumed that this smooth evolution changes rather abruptly at some scale near Λ_{QCD} , giving way to a new evolution in which relatively simple non-canonical parton structure and few-body interactions begin to dominate the dynamical structure of QCD. I have guessed that a few simple operators that display singular infrared behavior will emerge after being canceled perturbatively over many scales to prevent many-parton intermediate states from continuing to cancel their effects. A constituent picture emerges because these operators require only a few constituents to produce non-perturbative effects, and they self-consistently turn off the many-parton effects that would block a simple constituent picture from emerging.

Such an abrupt change is too naive, and must give way to a more reasonable evolution in which singular interactions gradually cause the QCD Hamiltonian to

depart from its perturbative trajectory. Whether such a gradual change can be self-consistently approximated by considering a sequence of structural layers, each of which immediately requires only a few partons, is not clear. Perturbative evolution never requires us to explicitly consider the effects of more than a few partons on subsequent parton or interaction structure, because at any order of perturbation theory a limited number of partons can be generated. The strength of the renormalization group lies in its ability to unravel an arbitrarily large number of scales when there is some sort of self-similarity that can be uncovered. This self-similarity is most easily revealed when the Hamiltonian trajectory lies near a fixed point so that the Hamiltonian quite clearly continues to reproduce itself in form. It is likely that new ideas will be required to solve QCD. For example, instead of staying near a fixed point, we might imagine a physical trajectory that lies near a reference trajectory, allowing us to use a new set of perturbative renormalization group equations that describe the evolution of the deviations of the physical trajectory from the reference trajectory.

My outline of the three renormalization problems encountered in Hamiltonian light-front field theory is motivated by the study of perturbation theory, in which momentum eigenstates are reasonable approximations. As the Hamiltonian leaves the vicinity of the critical Gaussian fixed point, this ceases to be true, and the power counting rules that govern my classification of light-front renormalization problems may cease to be relevant.

There is little work on light-front infrared renormalization, and field theorists typically avoid formalisms that cause the infrared region of phase space to appear radically different from other regions. Wilson speculates that infrared renormalization hides complex structure that may prove central to the solution of QCD[14]. This speculation seems strange if one only studies perturbation theory, where singular infrared effects are typically canceled; and it is difficult to understand how field theory can exploit vastly different infrared longitudinal structure and ultraviolet transverse structure, and still maintain both boost and rotational symmetries. Progress in this direction is slowed by a common unwillingness to explore totally new territory where old maps are of limited use and where we must expect to get lost often while slowly developing new maps.

Perhaps the weakest point in my description of light-front renormalization problems is the problem of exactly zero longitudinal momentum. There are no ‘vacuum modes’ in the formulation I use, so there can be no direct confrontation of dynamical effects produced by degrees of freedom with zero longitudinal momentum. Asymptotic freedom severely constrains the operators the vacuum can produce, unless they are relevant, marginal, or nonlocal. If they are relevant or marginal, we can hope to discover them when doing hadronic structure calculations, and control them using a renormalization group.

Perhaps the most interesting example is provided by chiral symmetry breaking. As far as I know, the perturbative renormalization group will not produce a chiral symmetry breaking operator. While it is true that a quark mass is produced, this

operator does not break chiral symmetry in light-front coordinates[14, 13]. The only operator that violates chiral symmetry in the canonical Hamiltonian is a relevant quark-gluon vertex that is proportional to a quark mass. One would normally assume that this operator is only responsible for explicit chiral symmetry breaking, and is not produced by spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking. One radical possibility is that the pion will emerge as a massless particle without requiring any chiral symmetry breaking operator in the Hamiltonian, because chiral symmetry takes a new form in light-front coordinates. I do not think that this is likely.

If the chiral symmetry breaking operator is local in the transverse direction, it should be relevant. The reason is simple. If the operator produces observable hadronic mass splittings at the scale Λ_{QCD} , it cannot be infinitesimal at this scale. Any finite irrelevant operator tends to blow up exponentially in magnitude as one runs the cutoff to larger values, and this makes it difficult to imagine how asymptotic freedom could survive. While marginal operators do not blow up exponentially, their strength tends to decrease only logarithmically and typically they increase logarithmically. Again, since asymptotic freedom is itself only a logarithmic effect, it is hard to see how it can survive the introduction of a new marginal operator. On the other hand, a relevant operator of reasonable strength at small cutoffs will decrease in magnitude at an exponential rate as the cutoff is raised, causing no trouble for asymptotic freedom.

If the chiral symmetry breaking operator is nonlocal, it will be much more difficult to find it, and our best hope is to study longitudinal scaling properties of the theory. The renormalization group machinery I developed is useful for running a transverse cutoff, but we must run a longitudinal momentum cutoff to understand the longitudinal scaling properties of QCD. It is fairly easy to show that a longitudinal renormalization group will not have a simple perturbative realization with a free Hamiltonian fixed point[18]. When a longitudinal cutoff is changed, states with nearly the same energies that coupled with the initial cutoff cease to couple with the new cutoff, and small energy denominators appear in the perturbative expansion of the transformation. This does not mean no longitudinal renormalization group exists, but it means that we must develop a non-perturbative renormalization group to study longitudinal scaling.

There are certainly many calculations in 1+1 dimensions that have not been done, and many of these can serve as publishable pedagogical exercises. However, 1+1 dimensions differs drastically from 3+1 dimensions and can even be more difficult in some cases because there are an infinite number of renormalizable operators. In the Schwinger model, perhaps the most interesting remaining problem is to show that the vacuum structure of the theory that I ignore has some effect on finite momentum observables (*i.e.*, the stuff a 1+1 dimensional experimentalist could see, and not just the stuff a 1+1 dimensional theorist might worry about). If this can be shown, the Schwinger model might provide guidance for how we should fix vacuum counterterms in QCD.

There are a large number of simple 3+1 dimensional problems that have not been

done, even in perturbation theory. Many theorists have been interested in how to map light-front perturbation theory onto manifestly covariant Feynman perturbation theory. In the process of drawing such maps, however, little or no attention is paid to the need to perform non-perturbative calculations, and tricks are used that can only be applied in perturbation theory. Moreover, these maps do not exploit the unique strengths of light-front coordinates and may even seem to indicate that these strengths are flaws. Pick any theory, use a cutoff that violates symmetries, and you will have a difficult time finding calculations in the literature.

The non-perturbative renormalization group pioneered by Wilson is in its infancy and is not even completely defined yet. Very few theorists have applied this type of formalism to light-front problems, but I believe this situation will change, because there are no other realistic alternatives. What we need are tractable non-perturbative renormalization group calculations. I have mentioned a possibility I would like to explore. If we do not insist that $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ is a fixed point, but allows it to contain interactions that do not change particle number, a non-perturbative renormalization group might be developed that preserves many of the features of the perturbative renormalization group. The problem with this type of idea is that once $\mathcal{H}_0^\Lambda$ contains an interaction, even the linear approximation of the transformation requires the non-perturbative solution of many-body problems. Such problems are typically intractable, so we must approximate the linear transformation. Wilson's phase space cell techniques may prove useful, especially if we tailor the interactions to take a simple form in a wavelet basis, as is done in shell model calculations for example.

Coupling coherence is a recent development and very few calculations have been completed. The most important issue is whether it can be applied usefully to non-perturbative renormalization group calculations. The only perturbative calculations I have completed that are non-perturbative in the couplings use an $\hbar$ expansion. Since the basic idea requires all new counterterms to go to zero as a canonical coupling goes to zero, the statement of the principle is perturbative in nature. In order to use the idea non-perturbatively, it may be necessary to construct a trajectory that extends to a Gaussian fixed point. If this is not possible, other ideas may be required to fix all counterterms, such as the restoration of symmetries violated by the cutoffs.

There are many applications of coupling coherence in QED and QCD that should be studied. For example, in QED one can perform many perturbative calculations to test whether coupling coherence restores gauge invariance. This happens to lowest order in electron-electron scattering, and to lowest order coupling coherence supplies the counterterms required to insure that the physical photon is massless, but higher order calculations must be completed and additional observables checked.

Coupling coherence can be applied to operators other than the Hamiltonian. An important example is the electromagnetic current itself. After a similarity transformation has been defined to bring the Hamiltonian towards the diagonal, it must be applied to all other observables. After applying a similarity transformation to the canonical current operator, one will find many new operators. The coherent current

operator will not change in form, but will depend on the cutoff only because the physical couplings and masses depend on the cutoff. This means, for example, that the current operator must contain two-body terms, and these new terms can be tested by determining whether the new current is conserved. As an additional interesting example, one can check that the axial anomaly is correctly produced.

There should be many applications of coupling coherence outside of light-front field theory. For example, one might perform non-perturbative tests of the idea on the lattice. Chiral symmetries might supply important examples.

The similarity transformation is also a recent development that has been applied to very few problems. It is remarkable to me that this formalism was not developed long ago by many-body theorists, who have long used effective Hamiltonian techniques, and who have long faced the problems posed by small energy denominators. The similarity transformation may have important applications in the nuclear shell model, for example; and in condensed matter systems.

My examples were all perturbative, and it is important to find non-perturbative approximations for the transformation. It is likely that the formalism developed by Glazek and Wilson will evolve as new applications appear. Even in my perturbative studies I have found it convenient to modify their formulation so that coupling coherence is possible, and there are likely to be many similarity transformations from which we can choose depending on the problem. Any problem for which non-perturbative renormalization group calculations exist is a candidate for application of the similarity transformation, with Wilson's own work on fixed source theory[44] and the Kondo problem[20] providing two obvious examples.

The number of problems that we can study in QED is extremely large. Most of these problems are of interest for the refinement of the formalism, both analytically and numerically; but it is possible that light-front field theory will offer non-perturbative approximations not available in other formalisms, as Brodsky has advocated for years. In the immediate future, it is important to thoroughly understand the cutoff dependence of the non-perturbative approximations I have suggested, and to demonstrate that we can readily obtain fine structure for positronium. The integral equations I have set up in this paper need to be solved numerically, and extended to higher orders. Of particular interest are excited states with non-zero angular momentum, because rotational invariance is violated when the second-order Hamiltonian is treated non-perturbatively. These violations should be small for low-lying states, and the leading perturbative corrections should start to restore rotational invariance. In both QED and QCD, rotational invariance will provide an important test for the approximations and can be used to fix the strength of interactions non-perturbatively.

Hydrogen offers a kinematic scenario that resembles the heavy plus light quark bound states, and the non-perturbative approximations required to solve it accurately will differ from those required for positronium. An ambitious goal is to reproduce the Lamb shift. The basic strategy has been known since Bethe's calculation[21], but an accurate reproduction of the Lamb shift by a calculation that has not been

specifically tailored for this purpose alone is quite demanding.

There are few perturbative light-front QCD calculations in existence, even at the level of one loop; and the ones that do exist need to be reproduced using the similarity transformation and coupling coherence. These calculations offer serious warm-up exercises for anyone who wants to study QCD non-perturbatively, at the minimum. If it is possible to carry such calculations to two loops, many lessons will no doubt be learned. Thorn discusses the interesting new mechanisms required for asymptotic freedom to arise in gluon self-interactions (see Thorn in Ref. [9]), and I have further emphasized the role of infrared cancellations in the quark-gluon vertex. I do not know whether it will be possible to complete all-orders proofs for light-front QCD with regulators that violate covariance and gauge invariance, but these would certainly be useful in establishing the connection of the light-front formalism with the well-established Lagrangian formalism.

Finally, the study of non-perturbative light-front QCD[14] has barely been initiated. The simple integral equations that result from minimizing the approximate energy I have derived need to be solved numerically for heavy quark systems, for glueballs, and for lighter quarks; if only to see whether these simple ideas provide a reasonable starting point. As in QED, it is important to see whether the results display an approximate rotational invariance, since this symmetry is violated in the non-perturbative calculations.

While this is being done, it is also necessary to carry the calculation of the QCD Hamiltonian to third and fourth order, to see whether the program is practical, whether the results improve, and whether the important non-perturbative aspects of the second-order calculation survive.

One of the primary advantages of deriving a constituent picture from QCD is that eigenstates need not be completely determined by the minimal valence configuration. While the ground state for any set of quantum numbers should be dominated by the minimal valence configuration, the program may still be practical if states containing a few additional partons are important for precision. Extra partons, especially gluons, should be especially important in excited states. My guess is that even the first excitation will begin to contain extra gluons, and it is even possible that hadrons in a fixed angular momentum multiplet will have different constituent structure. Since the rotation operators contain interactions that change particle number, it is possible for one polarization to be dominated by the minimal valence configuration while another includes an additional gluon, for example.

Ideally the simple second order Hamiltonian will produce reasonable results, and hopefully these results can be significantly improved by altering the strength of the second order operators by hand, using covariance as a guide.

At this point we simply do not know what will happen. Even if a constituent picture does arise in light-front QCD, it may differ from the constituent quark model in many significant ways.

I wish I could offer more answers. It would be nice to have at least a few solid

calculations that fit experimental data, even if the results are no better than those obtained by other methods. The fact of the matter is that the constituent quark model, the bag model, the Skyrme model, Schwinger-Dyson calculations, lattice QCD, and other approaches to the problem of bound states in QCD, are far ahead of light-front QCD when it comes to producing numbers. Hopefully I have shown that this program is rapidly approaching the point where numbers will be produced.

Finally I come to my main conclusion. This is an exciting *new* field, especially for young theorists. There is opportunity where there are many new problems that require developments at the level of *fundamental* field theory. While many may see this need as a weakness in this field, I hope that many young theorists will see it as the field's most appealing feature. *The added bonus is that these new problems are most interesting in QCD!*

15 Acknowledgments

I want to thank the organizers of Hadrons '94, especially Victoria Herscovitz and Cesar Vasconcellos, for their exceptional hospitality and for the opportunity to visit their beautiful country. I also extend warm thanks to Gastao Krein for his hospitality and for providing me the chance to calculate with few interruptions for an entire week! Many of the results in this paper were finalized in São Paulo. I also want to thank Ken Wilson, who has patiently taught me much of what makes sense in this paper. I have also learned a great deal from Stan Glazek and Avaroth Harindranath, and I have had fruitful discussions with many other theorists. Finally, it is a pleasure to thank my students Brent Allen, Martina Brisudová, and Billy Jones, who have corrected and extended much of this work. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Nos. PHY-9102922 and PHY-9409042, and the Presidential Young Investigator Program under Grant PHY-8858250.

References

- [1] An extensive list of references on light-front physics (*light.tex*) is available via anonymous ftp from pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu in the subdirectory pub/infolight.
- [2] P.A.M. Dirac, Rev. Mod. Phys. **21**, 392 (1949).
- [3] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **150**, 1313 (1966).
- [4] S. Fubini and G. Furlan, Physics **1**, 229 (1965);
R. Dashen and M. Gell-Mann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **17**, 340 (1966).

- [5] For an excellent review and references, see A. Bassetto, G. Nardelli and R. Soldati, *Yang-Mills Theories in Algebraic Non-covariant Gauges* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1991).
- [6] For a fairly complete list of DLCQ references see Ref. 1 and S.J. Brodsky and H.C. Pauli, *Light-Cone Quantization and Quantum Chromodynamics*, Recent Aspects of Quantum Fields, H. Mitter and H. Gausterer, Eds., Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 396 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991).
- [7] For the development of the CQM, see: M. Gell-Mann, Phys. Lett. **8**, 214 (1964); G. Zweig, CERN Reports Th. 401 and 412 (1964), and in Proc. Int. School of Phys. “Ettore Majorana”, Erice, Italy (1964), A. Zichichi, Ed., p.192 (Academic, New York, 1965);
H. J. Lipkin, Phys. Rep. **C8**, 173 (1973);
O. W. Greenberg, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sci. **28**, 327 (1978).
- [8] R. P. Feynman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 1415 (1969);
J. D. Bjorken and E. A. Paschos, Phys. Rev. **185**, 1975 (1969);
R. P. Feynman, *Photon-hadron interactions* (Benjamin, Reading, Mass., 1972);
J. B. Kogut and L. Susskind, Phys. Rep. **C8**, 75 (1973).
- [9] E. Tomboulis, Phys. Rev. **D8**, 2736 (1973);
A. Casher, Phys. Rev. **D14**, 452 (1976);
W. A. Bardeen and R. B. Pearson, Phys. Rev. **D13**, 547 (1976);
C. B. Thorn, Phys. Rev. **D19**, 639; **D20**, 1934 (1979);
W. A. Bardeen, R. B. Pearson, E. Rabinovici, Phys. Rev. **D21**, 1037 (1980);
G.P. Lepage and S.J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. **D22**, 2157 (1980);
V. A. Franke, Y. V. Novozhilov, and E. V. Prokhvatilov, Lett. Math. Phys. **5**, 239; 437 (1981);
G.P. Lepage, S.J. Brodsky, T. Huang and P. B. Mackenzie, in *Particles and Fields 2*, A. Z. Capri and A. N. Kamal, Eds. (Plenum, New York, 1983);
St. D. Glazek, Phys. Rev. **D38**, 3277 (1988);
S. J. Brodsky and G. P. Lepage, in *Perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics*, A. H. Mueller, Ed. (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989);
E. V. Prokhvatilov and V. A. Franke, Sov. J. Nucl Phys. **49**, 688 (1989);
P. A. Griffin, Nucl. Phys. **B372**, 270 (1992).
- [10] D. Mustaki, S. Pinsky, J. Shigemitsu, and K. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **D43**, 3411 (1991).
- [11] R. J. Perry, Phys. Lett. **300B**, 8 (1993).
- [12] W. M. Zhang and A. Harindranath, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 4868; 4881; 4903 (1993).

- [13] D. Mustaki, *Chiral symmetry and the constituent quark model: A null-plane point of view*, Bowling Green State Univ. preprint (1994).
- [14] K. G. Wilson, T. S. Walhout, A. Harindranath, W.-M. Zhang, R. J. Perry, St. D. Głazek, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 6720 (1994).
- [15] St. D. Głazek and K.G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 5863 (1993).
- [16] St. D. Głazek and K.G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 4214 (1994).
- [17] C. Bloch, Nucl. Phys. **6**, 329 (1958).
- [18] R. J. Perry, Ann. Phys. **232**, 116 (1994).
- [19] R. J. Perry and K. G. Wilson, Nucl. Phys. **B403**, 587 (1993).
- [20] K. G. Wilson, Rev. Mod. Phys. **47**, 773 (1975).
- [21] J. Schwinger, *Quantum Electrodynamics* (Dover, New York, 1958).
- [22] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B35**, 167 (1971).
- [23] P. N. Bogolioubov, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré **8**, 163 (1967);
A. Chodos, R. L. Jaffe, K. Johnson, C. B. Thorn and V. Weisskopf, Phys. Rev. **D9**, 3471 (1974);
A. Chodos, R. L. Jaffe, K. Johnson and C. B. Thorn, Phys. Rev. **D10**, 2599 (1974).
- [24] S. Okubo, Phys. Lett. **5**, 163 (1963);
G. Zweig, CERN report no. 8419/TH 412 (1964);
J. Iizuka, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **37-8**, 21 (1966).
- [25] J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **125**, 397 (1962); Phys. Rev. **128**, 2425 (1962).
- [26] J. Lowenstein and A. Swieca, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **68**, 172 (1971).
- [27] H. Bergknoff, Nucl. Phys. **B122**, 215 (1977).
- [28] G. McCartor, Z. Phys. **C52**, 611 (1991).
- [29] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B75**, 461 (1974).
- [30] M. Burkardt, Nucl. Phys. **A504**, 762 (1989);
K. Hornbostel, S. J. Brodsky, and H. C. Pauli, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 3814 (1990);
M. Burkardt, Nucl. Phys. **B373**, 613 (1992).
- [31] S. Coleman, R. Jackiw and L. Susskind, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **93**, 267 (1975).
- [32] S. Coleman, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **101**, 239 (1976).

- [33] T. Eller, H.-C. Pauli and S.J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. **D35**, 1493 (1987).
- [34] C.M. Yung and C.J. Hamer, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 2598 (1991).
- [35] D.P. Crewther and C.J. Hamer, Nucl. Phys. **B170**, 353 (1980).
- [36] Y. Ma and J.R. Hiller, J. Comp. Phys. **82**, 229 (1989).
- [37] Y. Mo and R.J. Perry, J. Comp. Phys. **108**, 159 (1993).
- [38] S.J. Chang, R.G. Root, and T.M. Yan, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 1133 (1973).
- [39] S.J. Chang and T.M. Yan, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 1147 (1973).
- [40] L.D. Faddeev and A.A. Slavnov, *Gauge Fields* (Benjamin, Reading, Mass., 1980).
- [41] F.J. Wegner, Phys. Rev. **B5**, 4529 (1972); **B6**, 1891 (1972);
F.J. Wegner, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, C. Domb and M.S. Green, Eds., Vol. 6 (Academic Press, London, 1976).
- [42] P.A.M. Dirac, in *Perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics*, D.W. Duke and J.F. Owens, Eds. (Am. Inst. Phys., New York, 1981).
- [43] R. Oehme, K. Sibold, and W. Zimmerman, Phys. Lett. **B147**, 115 (1984);
R. Oehme and W. Zimmerman, Comm. Math. Phys. **97**, 569 (1985);
W. Zimmerman, Comm. Math. Phys. **97**, 211 (1985);
J. Kubo, K. Sibold, and W. Zimmerman, Nuc. Phys. **B259**, 331 (1985);
R. Oehme, Prog. Theor. Phys. Supp. **86**, 215 (1986);
C. Lucchesi, O. Piguet, and K. Sibold, Phys. Lett. **B201**, 241 (1988);
E. Kraus, Nucl. Phys. **B349**, 563 (1991).
- [44] K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **D2**, 1438 (1970).
- [45] L.D Faddeev and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1692 (1988).
- [46] J. D. Bjorken and S. D. Drell, *Relativistic Quantum Mechanics* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1964);
J. D. Bjorken and S. D. Drell, *Relativistic Quantum Fields* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965).
- [47] A. C. Tang, S. J. Brodsky, and H. C. Pauli, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 1842 (1991).
- [48] I. Tamm, J. Phys. (USSR) **9**, 449 (1945);
S. M. Dancoff, Phys. Rev. **78**, 382 (1950);
R. J. Perry, A. Harindranath and K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2959 (1990).
- [49] M. Krautgartner, H. C. Pauli, and F. Wolz, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 3755 (1992).

- [50] M. Kaluza and H. C. Pauli, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 2968 (1992).
- [51] M. Kaluza and H.-J. Pirner, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 1620 (1993).
- [52] S. Glazek, A. Harindranath, S. Pinsky, J. Shigemitsu, and K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 1599 (1993).
- [53] D. J. Gross and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**, 1343 (1973);
H. D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**, 1346 (1973).
- [54] S. Mandelstam, Nucl. Phys. **B213**, 149 (1983).
- [55] G. Leibbrandt, Phys. Rev. **D29**, 1699 (1984).
- [56] For a discussion in the context of asymptotic freedom, see T. D. Lee, *Particle Physics and Introduction to Field Theory* (Harwood, New York, 1981).
- [57] G. Curci, W. Furmanski, and R. Petronzio, Nucl. Phys. **B175**, 27 (1980).
- [58] A. Harindranath and J.P. Vary, Phys Rev. **D36**, 1141 (1987); **D37**, 1076 (1988).
- [59] C. Quigg and J.L. Rosner, Phys. Lett. **71B**, 153 (1977).
- [60] *Quarkonia*, W. Buchmüller, Ed. (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992).